

92 00958

A Management Audit of
The Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens

CONFIDENTIAL

Conducted by Melanie Beene and Associates

**M. Melanie Beene
Wallace I. Edgecombe
Stephen Gong
Juliana Grenzeback
Laurie MacDougall
Joan Madison
Regina Mouton
Ann Seamster
William E. Terry
Sherry Kafka Wagner**

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 17 1992

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

April 1992

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Mission	10
Facilities	14
Programming	18
Marketing and Audience Development	28
Public, Community and Constituent Relations	36
Fundraising	40
Governance	48
Management	51
Budget Projections	58
Summary	62
Appendices	68

Introduction

The report that follows was solicited by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) through a Request for Consulting Services dated October 7, 1991. Following a competitive process, a contract was awarded on December 13, 1991 to conduct a management audit of the Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens (CFA).

Methodology

The audit was to include an in-depth, independent, diagnostic assessment of the current operations and long range strategic plans of the Center including its mission, facilities, programming, financing, marketing, administration, community relations and governance. The approach that Melanie Beene and Associates took to this task was to utilize the expertise of a diverse team of consultants.

Both because the project itself is striving to encompass diversity, and because projecting into an unknown future for a new entity is a difficult undertaking about which reasonable people can differ, it was our belief that a proper assessment should involve as much diversity of input as was realistically possible. Thus, we included input from both local and national experts in the arts, from consultants who have experience in both large and small-budgeted organizations, and programming expertise that is reflective of the diverse constituencies of the Bay Area community. The study team included ten consultants, six local and four from other parts of the country. These included working arts professionals with direct understanding of and experience working with African-American, Asian-American, Latino and Native American artists and arts organizations. Their resumes are included at Appendix A.

While a management audit could have been accomplished more efficiently with fewer personnel, it is our conviction that this process benefited from the diversity of its participants. Thus, the comments and conclusions presented here represent the consensus of the entire group's best thinking.

The data on which this report is based was gathered from the following:

1. Review and analysis of written documents, including: bylaws, articles of incorporation, operating agreements, one year of board minutes, public relations and fundraising materials, the Strategic Plan, current and projected operating

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of the research on the effects of climate change on the environment. The report will discuss the various ways in which climate change is affecting the world, from rising sea levels to more frequent and severe weather events. It will also explore the potential consequences of these changes and the steps that need to be taken to mitigate them.

Climate change is a global issue that affects everyone. It is caused by the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, which trap heat and lead to a warming of the planet. This warming has a variety of effects on the environment, including melting glaciers and ice sheets, rising sea levels, and more frequent and severe weather events. These changes can have a significant impact on human health and the economy.

One of the most significant impacts of climate change is the melting of glaciers and ice sheets. This is causing sea levels to rise, which threatens coastal cities and infrastructure. Another major impact is the increase in the frequency and severity of weather events, such as hurricanes, droughts, and wildfires. These events can cause significant damage to property and loss of life. Climate change is also affecting the environment in other ways, such as by causing the extinction of species and the degradation of ecosystems. It is important to understand the full extent of these impacts in order to develop effective strategies to address them.

There is a growing body of scientific evidence that supports the conclusion that climate change is a real and urgent threat to the world. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued several reports that document the science of climate change and its potential impacts. These reports have been widely cited by governments, scientists, and the public. It is clear that we need to take action now to address climate change and prevent the worst outcomes.

The following sections of this report will provide a detailed look at the various impacts of climate change on the environment. It will discuss the effects on the oceans, the atmosphere, and the land. It will also explore the potential consequences of these changes and the steps that need to be taken to mitigate them. The report will conclude with a summary of the key findings and a call to action for the public and policymakers.

budgets, historical documents,¹ plans and schematics for the facilities, and a review of the facilities model.

2. Interviews with all individual staff members, and select board, agency, and community representatives including funders, potential users and audiences, other area presenters and facility managers. A complete list of interviews is included at Appendix B. Regrettably, interview time was limited by budget constraints.
3. A meeting with select Center for the Arts board members (President Mel Lee, Chip Conley, William Osterhaus), SFRA commissioners (Fei Tsen, Haig Mardikian, Sonia Bolanos), the Yerba Buena project director, Helen Sause, and CFA executive director, Jerry Allen, to review the mission and mandate of the project.
4. Attendance at the February 1992 regularly scheduled board meeting.
5. Attendance at a SFRA Commissioners' meeting.
6. An all-day on-site evaluation with six of the study team; the Center for the Arts staff; Yerba Buena project director, Helen Sause; and select Center for the Arts board members at various points throughout the day (Rena Bransten, Michaela Cassidy, Helene Freed, Angela Giddens, William Osterhaus, Donald Tayer, Ned Topham).

This report is presented as a confidential document for internal use by the Agency and the Center for the Arts in addressing the issues discussed within. The report is organized with an initial introductory analysis that takes an overview perspective on the interlocking relationship of parts that make this project especially complex. That is followed by individual sections which address in greater detail and with specific recommendations the separate areas of: mission, facilities, programming, marketing, public/community relations, fundraising, governance, management and budget projections. A summary section concludes this report.

¹ Arts Community Cultural Planning Process Task Force Reports (1981); YBC Cultural Planning Workbook; Design Scenario: Yerba Buena Center Cultural Plan (1981); Final Report of the User Study of Proposed Cultural Facilities at Yerba Buena Center (1982); Recommendations Regarding the Yerba Buena Gardens Cultural Facilities by the Cultural Planning Technical Assistance Committee (1983); Report on Governance and Management of the Cultural Component at Yerba Buena Gardens (1985); Management Center Review of Yerba Buena Gardens Cultural Center Budget for 1991-92 (1991)

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the existence of a solution of the system of equations (1) in the case of a general system of equations.

2. In the second part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (2) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

3. In the third part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (3) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

4. In the fourth part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (4) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

5. In the fifth part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (5) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

6. In the sixth part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (6) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

7. In the seventh part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (7) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

8. In the eighth part of the paper, we consider the case of a system of equations of the form (8) and show that the system has a solution in the case of a general system of equations.

It is our conviction that this project must be a success and our purpose in these observations is to provide the decision makers with information that can be utilized in achieving that success. It is important that the Center for the Arts be a success for many reasons:

- the community energy, hopes and aspirations that have been called to bear upon its envisioning;
- the time, effort, and public expenditures, both in capital and operating funds already invested in this effort;
- the role that these facilities will play in the synergy of the Yerba Buena redevelopment project.
- the significant role that CFA is poised to play in the national explorations of cultural pluralism.

This project is exceedingly complex and difficult. It is important to have a full appreciation of the factors that create that complexity—many of which cannot be resolved—in order to properly determine how to approach the Center's current issues. Knowing how Center for the Arts got to where it is today will potentially illuminate the next steps. Some of the key factors influencing the project are enumerated in the discussion below.

Key Factors Influencing the Project

1. The Center for the Arts is the progeny of a real estate transaction.

Almost without exception producing arts organizations are either artist-driven or board-driven. They are fueled by the passion of artists who need a forum for their creative expression (for example, a dance company founded by a choreographer), or by community people who desire the experience of that creative expression (for example, a town which wants its own symphony orchestra). The Center for the Arts is neither artist-driven nor board-driven, and therefore is being constructed, in many ways, backwards.

A typical developmental sequence for an arts organization is: 1) driving idea/product promoted by a few visionaries; 2) achieving a critical mass of people passionately committed to that idea/product; 3) search for resources/funding; 4) search for place to perform; 5) implementation of product. Throughout the life of the organization this sequence is repeated, with the end result being a function of how successful the group is at implementing its product (quality) and at interesting others in either buying the product or donating to the organization.

Ironically, this project started in exact reverse of that sequence—as a consequence of negotiations with the master developer of a major urban redevelopment project, arts facilities were thrown in as a give-back to the community. Thus,

Center for the Arts started with a building, and the guarantee of resources. Since then, it has been struggling to find an idea/product and a group of people to be committed to it.

2. The extended time lag in commitment and action by the Agency and the Master Developer has put the project at risk.

The unique tasks of this project—finding a product and a group of people committed to it—have been seriously impeded by the innumerable and extensive delays in getting the project off the ground. While the board was incorporated in 1986, six years ago, it is only in the last year that it became certain the project would actually go forward. This delay resulted in the board putting its commitments and fundraising activities on hold. Similarly, the Redevelopment Agency held up the hiring of Program Directors so long that the most desirable candidates took other positions and the search process had to be restarted a year later.

This general feeling of "is this really going to happen?", held by board, staff and community, has dampened all efforts of the venture to date. Because so much time has elapsed (nearly 30 years since the Yerba Buena project inception, and more than 12 years since active planning on the arts component began): 1) there is enormous confusion in the arts community about what Center for the Arts is supposed to be; 2) the external circumstances that dictated the design and original plan have changed; and, 3) the people with the most grounding in and institutional memory of the project (those with six years board experience) are now about to cycle off the board.

3. The external environment has changed significantly since the project's inception.

One indicator of a well-managed organization is its ability to track and respond appropriately to the changes in the external environment. This is critical in a start-up organization.

The circumstances and context for this project have changed radically since its inception. Some of these changes include:

- the loss of the master developer;
- the loss of the underground parking garage for the facilities, and its income stream;
- the change in timeline and scheduling. Originally the arts component would have come on-line as the last element in a retail/residential

mixed-used development. Currently, it will go in as the first component and will attempt to operate in the midst of a ten-year construction site;

- changes in the guaranteed income stream for the project, such that the project is currently projected to be underfunded by 1998 even operating solely as a rental house;
- changes in national, regional and local economies with accompanying altered patterns of behavior, interests, and attendance at arts events;
- a city budget crisis with layoffs and budget reductions anticipated;
- changes within the arts community itself and with the groups that compose it. For example, two additional theaters have become operational since the time of CFA's planning. A number of groups involved in that planning process have subsequently gone out of business (e.g., Performing Arts Services, Pocket Opera, Eureka Theater, San Francisco Repertory Theater), while others are at risk of doing so; and still other potential users have since acquired their own spaces (e.g., Asian American Theatre Company, George Coates Performance Works, and Lorraine Hansberry Theater).

All these factors indicate that adjustments in thinking are necessary for the project to fit successfully into the current physical setting, market conditions, and external environment.

4. It is questionable whether the facilities, as configured, are sufficiently "needed" by the community to ensure the operation's economic viability.

Without commenting on the reliability of the original user studies, we will assert that in the current environment it is questionable whether the city needs a 750-seat theater. Among the local presenters we spoke with, there was major disappointment over the size of the theater. What is needed is a 1,200 to 1,500-seat house to fill the gap between the Herbst and Palace of Fine Arts Theaters (in the 1000-seat range) and Davies Hall and the Opera House (in the 3,000-seat range). At 750 seats, the CFA theater will be too small for many national touring shows, and too big for the audiences of most local contemporary and multicultural arts organizations.

A key element in the Center's economic viability will be the union costs, which have yet to be negotiated. These costs alone could make the space too expensive for small to mid-sized organizations to use.

5. The governance structure of the organization is a hybrid one which will continue to create tensions/limitations for the organization.

A consistent recommendation of the multi-year community planning process was that the Center was to be managed by an independent community board of directors. One presumes this was to ensure the artistic decisions would be free from government influence. What has been created, however, is more of a hybrid organization than a completely independent entity. While Center for the Arts is legally an independent 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization, there are certain restrictions on its operations dictated by the Redevelopment Agency, not as a function of its contract relationship, but within the actual bylaws of Center for the Arts. These include, among others: Agency approval of CFA's budget; Agency approval of CFA's bylaw changes; Agency approval of the Center's policy for public use; Agency approval of donor name recognition by the Center; and the requirement that CFA board meetings be public.

Whatever the legal and bylaw relationship between the two entities, the Center for the Arts *de facto* functions and is currently viewed in the community as analogous to a wholly-owned subsidiary of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. To what degree this situation can change is unknown. Certainly as long as 100% of the budget is funded by the SFRA it will be reviewed as an Agency project with the perceived accountability flowing first to the Agency—a situation that undercuts the effectiveness of the Board as an independent entity. Its independence is further compromised in that agency commissioners are part of the membership, lending a quasi-governmental agency aura to board membership, which in turn affects the development of an effective fundraising capacity. To some extent, the degree to which the Board feels owned by the Agency influences the degree to which it will be able to give and to raise money from the community.

Few donors are willing to make financial contributions to government agencies. Since, at this juncture, the Center is perceived as quasi-governmental, it has logically experienced great difficulty in raising funds from outside sources. This is not to say that fundraising from the community is impossible, but that there are barriers to overcome in interesting these donors. Their gifts, if they come at all, most likely will follow the implementation of the project, rather than seed its happening.

6. There is an inadequate knowledge base of the functioning of the producing arts industry within the board, staff and Agency to ensure proper implementation of or accountability for the project.

To date, the Center for the Arts has been designed more as a government agency than as an arts organization. Of the ten staff, six have no prior experience working in an arts organization; of the four that do have prior experience, only one—the Operations Director—has worked in a organization of the type that Center for the Arts will be (presenting/facility management). This lack of practical experience pervades the organization and leaves the overall impression that no one knows what to do next.

The best illustration of this is the failure to appreciate the primary function of the organization—product development—which in this case is programming. It is as if you set out to build a widget factory, but three years into the project no one on the staff knows how to make widgets.

The product is paramount. The organization has been staffed (some would say overstaffed) for more than three years; it is 16 months away from opening a major facility with seven potentially separate venues; and there is no indication as to: what the product will be (note that many touring organizations book several years in advance); how it will be produced; at what cost; where the funding will come from; what the market niche will be; who the potential customers are; how they will be sold the product; and how much it will cost in money, time, and effort to sell them. This is where the entire project should start—with the product.

7. The project is conceived and operating under erroneous assumptions.

The Executive Director has interpreted his mandate for the organization to mean CFA should spring forth fully grown at birth, comparable to a major arts organization. According to his calculations this means the first year out as a new arts organization, CFA shall have already successfully completed a capital campaign of \$4 million, raised \$2 million in operating funds, and \$1+ million in endowment, plus be so successful that it is able to sell a full schedule of events at more than 60% capacity (approximately 30,000 ticket buyers). This level of accomplishment exceeds what many of the nation's finest have been able to achieve in decades of producing acclaimed work. Just by way of comparison, the Mark Taper Forum, centrally located in Los Angeles and producing innovative and often multicultural work, is celebrating its 25th season and has yet to raise more than \$1.8 million in annual operating funds.

By saddling itself with unrealistically high expectations, CFA is creating a recipe for failure that does not acknowledge the dynamic, incremental way in which arts

organizations, most particularly presenting organizations, grow. Audiences for a facility evolve over time as they began to develop "house trust," or a confidence in the consistency of the program offerings. Likewise the donor pool evolves, in part, out of that audience, and those donors help to convince institutional funders of the importance of their support as well.

8. The mission of the organization is poorly articulated and inadequately understood.

The Center is poised in time and place to be able to make a significant leadership contribution to the national dialogue about creating a culturally pluralistic society and evolving new ways of being and doing. The consensus of the management study team, however, was that the potential of the mission was not adequately grasped by the board or staff.

The staffing structure seems inappropriate for what is needed.

A new arts organization coming into existence in a time of overwhelming change on every level should reflect and anticipate 21st century reality in its organizational design and functioning, not 19th century industrial structures or 20th century corporate models. New times and new ideas require new modes of functioning. The organization, as it has developed and been planned to date, is no different from an organization coming into being in 1950 or 1960. This is not a good indicator of the capacity of these leaders to successfully implement this idea. The more ominous indicator is that the organization has been constructed from the top down with the productive element—the programming or the product—the very last thing considered and still not in place or underway.

The ultimate and primary responsibility for the product and its development ought to be the Executive Director's. That is why s/he has authority. Structurally the person ultimately responsible for the product should be the person with final authority. However, under Center for the Arts' proposed structure, the core of the organization is delegated to Program Directors (not yet on staff) who report to the Executive Director. It is foreseeable that this may create difficult problems down the road.

Conclusion

Some of these key factors can be altered and others cannot. The interplay of these issues frames a holistic understanding of how the Center for the Arts functions. They are discussed in more detail in the following sections. It is the

unanimous conclusion of our diverse management study team that the Center for the Arts is seriously off-track. Unless the project is radically reformed, we predict it will not succeed. The team was unanimously enthusiastic about the rich potential of the project, if correctly executed, to be of national significance.

Mission

The study team reviewed several different versions of a mission statement and found a lack of clarity and a lack of consensus of understanding among the organization's board and staff. There are particular areas of confusion around the following issues:

- **The issue of quality.** In some places the Center defines its goal with phrases such as "high quality" or "world's most innovative." To focus on quality in presenting multicultural work raises the much-debated topic of whose standards will be used to determine this quality. The way in which CFA is currently wording its commitment to "quality" signals a lack of sensitivity to this complex issue.

- **The issue of experimentation.** Descriptive adjectives such as, "high quality" and "cutting-edge experimentation," by definition are not necessarily the same, nor should they be. Other adjectives used in CFA literature include: "innovative," "risk-taking," "non-traditional" and "traditional."—terms which are vague, ill-defined and in opposition to each other.

To employ terms such as "traditional" and "cutting edge," "diversity" and "quality" in dialectic relation throughout the text of Center for the Arts' materials suggests an internal ambivalence toward the Center's goals and their achievement, and by reiterating the current debate that poses these terms as representative of exclusive dynamics, creates confusion and suspicion.

- **The issue of contemporary.** By focusing on contemporary, cutting edge, experimental work, the Center seems to be unaware of the fact that much multicultural work is traditional, not contemporary. And many of the existing audiences for this work are conservative audiences more interested in family values than in artistic experimentation. The notion that "multiculturalism" is synonymous with "on the cutting edge" is an anomaly.

- **The issue of accessibility.** The most recent version of the mission statement adds another layer of confusion with the terms: "popular," "entertaining" and "accessible." Potentially, these qualifications are mutually exclusive with cutting-edge experimentation. Just what is it that the Center wants to be?

Accessibility is also not merely a function of rental fee or admission price, but is a critical part of a community's understanding of its role in the creative process. CFA has not clearly communicated who its community is or what its role will be.

- **The issue of uniqueness.** There is a misapprehension that the Center's mission is unique when in fact it will be operating in terrain currently being worked by a number of other organizations. Statements such as "unlike any other arts center in the U.S."; "the nation's first cultural arts center devoted to the presentation of multicultural, interdisciplinary, contemporary art"; and "territory to which no American cultural institution has laid claim" are simply untrue.

One thinks immediately of the Brooklyn Academy of Music and the Walker Art Center as national examples, but locally Cal Performances and Theater Artaud have also made significant national reputations in this area. To continue to assert these claims only makes the Center appear foolish, and diminishes its credibility in the real leadership role it is positioned by time, place, and resources to play.

- **The issue of multiculturalism.** A shared meaning of the term "multicultural" is lacking at CFA. For some, the term is a code word for people of color, while for others this term included, variously: gays and lesbians, the handicapped, the economically disadvantaged, women or everyone. The organization does not appear to share a broader understanding of the complex, difficult issues imbedded in what gets called 'multiculturalism', nor to be aware of the national debate around the issues of cultural pluralism in the arts. The overall impression is that few on the board or staff are up to speed on these issues, either conceptually or in terms of attending local performances of relevant work.

Multiculturalism is not something new. Since the beginning of time the planet has been inhabited by diverse cultures composed of a majority of non-white peoples who express themselves through different languages and traditions. All cultures use language, sound, movement, and visual representation to express the range of human emotion and concern. That these diverse cultures perform and create their "artistic expressions" in contexts unfamiliar to those schooled in Western European traditions, and that they fail to participate in the parallel forms of Western European expression, does not make them "underserved," "deprived," or "culturally disadvantaged." In many respects, the "arts" of these cultures are infinitely richer and more integrally embedded in their communities than Western European art forms which have evolved in this country to the point that, too often, one's experience of them is more a privilege of class than a function of community.

Thus, diversity exists in fact. It is not only a contemporary condition of our society currently being recognized, but is also an historical component to the development of the Bay Region. The responsibility of the Center is to reflect that diversity in a meaningful and balanced way. Multiculturalism properly

understood is an inclusive opportunity to facilitate the artistic expressions of the broadest possible sample of the region.

The key to multiculturalism is shared power. How power is shared will be the survival issue in our increasingly interdependent, horizontally interconnected pluralistic system. These issues are being played out throughout all levels of our society. In times of major shifts in cultural consciousness even those with the most sincere intentions can easily be tripped up. To be part of such a paradigm shift—and this project has every opportunity to be a leader in it—requires a vigilant awareness and particular care in the way in which words are used lest they unwittingly exclude. It requires combating within ourselves fifteen hundred years of Western assumptions of cultural superiority initiated by the Greeks. It is an heroic battle.

For CFA, however, it feels as if the mission of multiculturalism is more one of political expediency than sincere commitment—almost a begrudging quasi-social service project for "the disadvantaged." "Multiculturalism" at CFA feels like a buzzword bandied about as the core of the mission. It is being defined and implemented in a condescending way by outsiders who have little feel and no apparent respect for the art or traditions of other cultures.

A further reflection of CFA's ambivalence toward its mission is the document titled "Role and Operating Philosophy." Expressions such as "culturally unglued" and "dangerous opportunity" regarding the current state of affairs in the arts, suggest a perspective representative of the dominant culture's sense of threat at the loss of its hegemony. In expressing his desire for the Center to "build an **indigenous** (our emphasis) American culture," the Executive Director seems to be unaware that an indigenous culture exists as one of many "American" cultures, and in fact predates the dominant culture's Western European import. It is comments such as these that put the thinking community on guard and raise the questions: Does the Center know what it is doing? Is it capable of doing what it says it wants to do?

These core flaws in the conception of the mission are the first causes from which the more easily-identifiable problems of the organization flow. Thus to address the technical, specific issues (for example, getting a marketing plan) in isolation is of no value, at least, of no lasting value. Unless the board, staff and agency are truly aligned with the broader mission of "shift in cultural consciousness," we predict the continuance of a potentially killing dissonance between word and deed, rhetoric and reality. To proceed with the currently prevailing attitude does fatal damage to the authentic concept of multiculturalism and its place in the world. It would be a tragedy to allow the Center for the Arts to become, as many are predicting, the next Festival 2000.

Recommendations

To survive effectively through time as something more than a rental facility requires that the board both individually and collectively buy into a value or sense of purpose for the organization that can be translated to others. We would recommend that the Center conduct a board and staff work session in which the mission statement is reviewed, discussed, clarified and rewritten. Issues to be refined are: Why does the CFA exist? What purpose does it serve? For whom? How will CFA as an organization evaluate its efforts?

Having clarified the mission, we would recommend the Center review existing printed materials, pull those that are inconsistent with the revised mission statement, and discontinue their distribution. Set up an orientation process that ensures that new board and staff know what the mission of the organization is. Devise a public relations strategy that clearly communicates the organization's mission to the general public and the intended constituency.

Facilities

No doubt the two new buildings will be attractive in themselves, befitting the fine reputations of their internationally-reknowned architects. The discussion here, however, deals with the buildings not as architecture, but as how they potentially serve the organization's mission, program and activities.

As designed, the buildings do not evoke, aid, or re-enforce the mission and challenge of the organization: to create a new and more culturally-diverse audience for the arts. While the two buildings that will comprise the Center for the Arts are designed by two different architects, they share a similarly stark style with massive modern exteriors that bespeak "government building." There is nothing in their design that says "multicultural," "ethnic" or "experimental."

Part of the current dialogue about barriers to creating a more culturally-diverse audience has to do with space, place and the symbolic meaning of structures. While most European-based arts events are experienced in what are sometimes derisively called culture palaces (in which the audiences sit quietly, separated from the performers), other traditions integrate their cultural expressions more directly in the ongoing life of the community. Thus, first-time, culturally-diverse audiences might potentially have been more comfortable in more informal settings than the traditional approaches taken here. For example, there are no places to sit down in either building, with the exception of the 40-seat upstairs cafe in the Visual Arts building. This deficiency undercuts the buildings' stated function as magnets or gathering places, particularly for visitors accompanied by seniors or children.

Ideally, the two buildings should have been oriented around a nucleus or "center," with the two lobbies facing one another to create a sense of connection or synergy between the spaces, to solidify that they are the same entity (The Center for the Arts) and to facilitate their joint usage by patrons. As it is, with the entrances of the buildings facing in different directions, there is nothing to draw people visually and organically from one building to the next. No amount of signage will create that integral sense of "center."

This lack of "center" is particularly an issue since the main box office will be in the Visual Arts building. Presumably, a ticket buyer at the theater's evening performance who wants to purchase advance tickets for another evening will have to leave the building and go outside and around to the box office in the adjacent building. These operational details of how the buildings will function need to be worked out now. For example, will the visual arts spaces and the cafe be open

before the theater performances? Obviously, these decisions will affect operating costs as well.

The Theater

The theater building is traditional in design and layout. Externally, it is unclear how (and by whom) the huge marquee which faces the side wall of the Forum will be read. It is also unclear why the video cubes, which presumably can project marquee information to Third Street traffic, will not be operational. Cost is given as a factor, but it seems curious to have approved architectural designs for an element that will enforce what has been promoted as a "state-of-the-art" facility, without also approving the accompanying costs. The sort of "at the source" program advertising that the video cubes could provide would be helpful to the marketing effort.

The theater has several limitations: the lack of a real public "Green Room" (the traditional artist/audience meeting place, as well as press room, in theaters.); the lack of rehearsal space (not currently budgeted for); a potentially too-small box-office; no upstairs bathroom for the VIP lounge; and very little public lobby space.

The equipment plans as outlined in the technical specifications are impressive. The question remains as to how much of this equipment will be able to be purchased. As the promise to the community has consistently been a "state-of-the-art" facility, it is imperative that the Redevelopment Agency deliver on this promise, whether or not the Center for the Arts' board of directors has raised the funds. The theater will be superior to other local venues because it will have a sprung floor, essential for dance performances. But for other, non-dance groups, without the enhanced equipment inventory that will be a part of the rental package, the theater will become a much less attractive rental value.

The Visual Arts Building

It does not appear that the traffic in the Visual Arts Building will flow easily from space to space (i.e., from lobby to anteroom, to medium gallery to large gallery and out again). Upstairs, the viewing room and the special gallery work well together, but should a large show (which would hang in all three galleries) be presented, it may be difficult to get people up to the special gallery. The large gallery with its glass walls may also be impractical for textile shows. Some thought should be given to the details of the traffic flow and signage now. In both this building and the theater, achieving the stated program goal of interdisciplinary and collaborative presentations will be limited by the the lack of

storage space, set and costume shops, and such collaborations may have to occur off-site.

The Forum, or multi-purpose room, feels like a white elephant. It is being touted as a smaller performance space for groups which cannot fill the theater, but the costs per seat may be higher than renting the theater, given the labor involved in setting up a small stage, tiered risers, and chairs (24 union-rate "golden-time" hours of turnaround anticipated). Such high set-up costs will also limit the Forum's use by lower-ticketed events such as lectures or poetry readings. The Forum design also limits its use for ancillary income generating events, such as a gala opening dinner for a theater premiere. There is very little space in the storage room next to the Forum in which to set up a kitchen and prepare food, which will make the space unattractive to caterers. Also, the access from the Forum to the loading dock is miles away through a circuitous route.

A bookstore is potentially a source of earned revenue for the Center, as well as a significant educational outlet. The current space is too small, however, and its storage is located across the lobby, making inventory replenishment more difficult. The square footage available for the bookstore will not be profitable enough to be attractive to commercial lessors. Even if it were, we would still recommend that the Center manage the bookstore as an aspect of its artistic programming.

The cafe, at forty seats, is too small (given your audience projections) and not conveniently located. Again this is a potential source of earned revenue and an important component in the ambience of the space. The restaurant possibilities need to be arranged now.

It is worth noting that this arts complex is neither innovative nor unique, separately nor as an arts complex. Many places around the country currently present the visual, media and performing arts in the same facilities—the Wexner Center (Columbus, Ohio), and the Hult Center for the Performing Arts (Eugene, Oregon), to name but a few (see chart at Appendix D). The hyperbolic promotional approach taken by the Center raises issues that will be addressed in the promotion and marketing sections of this report.

Recommendations

The Operations Director has a good grasp of the construction process and the capital costs. However, capital, equipment and start-up costs need to be plotted on a critical path chart that correlates with cash flow and programming deadlines so that the money (or an alternative plan) will be in place when it is needed. The

primary focus of fundraising now should be on naming opportunities within the facilities.

The SFRA should completely finish and equip the buildings before the official opening of CFA. Once the facility is opened, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to raise additional capital funds. If SFRA does not fully fund the furnishings, fixtures, and equipment, and choices must be made, we would recommend concentrating funds on the technical equipment before investing in more office furniture or other administrative amenities.

In the video/screening room we recommend against the installation of 35mm film projectors. Their cost (in the range of \$30,000) will probably not be recovered. (See media programming section for rationale.)

Plans should be developed to ensure that the bookstore, cafe and restaurant are operational at the time of the opening of the Center. Given the labor intensiveness and small profit margin of food service operations, we recommend that both the cafe and restaurant be managed by outside concessionaires.

The box office arrangement and size needs to be reviewed and enlarged if possible.

Program

Surprisingly, there is no program plan. This is attributed to the fact that there have been no Program Directors on staff. (They are due to start work in May 1992.) This critical absence of product evidences a potentially fatal lack of substantive expertise in the organization. The Center for the Arts must be led by someone capable of moving its program issues forward, with or without Program Directors. For an October, 1993, opening, it is very late in the timeline to be without a program schedule.

The Role of the Center for the Arts

The Center has identified four modes of programming: as a producer, a co-producer, a presenter and a renter. For the time being, the Center should focus on the roles of presenter and renter. This approach will accelerate the start-up process and begin to build confidence among the public, funders and decision makers. The more risk-taking and time-consuming commissioning projects should come further down the road, after the economic viability of the project has been established. Successful collaborations take enormous amounts of time to execute, and at this juncture the Center should concentrate on building its resources, contacts and credibility.

It is in the development of the Center as an "incubator . . . to create educational and interpretive programs that will establish a context in which to judge experimental, collaborative, and cross-cultural works," that the Center's real opportunities lie. The shaping of public receptivity and informed opinion are long term endeavors that must be approached in stages over time. We cannot underscore enough that working successfully in a project such as this is about correctly building and maintaining relationships.

Programming Prior to Opening

The Center has produced a number of small visual arts shows on its own office walls with the rationale of attempting to meet the three-years-of-producing requirement to apply for state and federal funds. Rather than hanging art on the office walls where no one can see it, the Center might consider framing its program more broadly to aid in its own planning process and to raise the public visibility of the Center before it opens.

For example, the Center could produce a symposium on the current thinking about marketing to culturally-diverse audiences. This is a topic of interest to both business and the arts, and such a symposium would be an opportunity for CFA to

take a leadership role in discussing this issue. CFA would also save itself time by first digesting what the for-profit world (and other non-profits working in this area) have already learned, and then figuring out what is applicable. Bringing the arts and business together in new ways around shared issues, would raise the profile of CFA in the business community and might even facilitate fundraising. Other cross-disciplinary topics of interest might include: multicultural issues in the workplace or quality indicators in culturally diverse work.

Rentals

The looming issue for the programming expense is the labor union costs. If the Center becomes a full union house, its rental costs will be beyond the reach of many of the groups the facility was supposed to serve. It is hard to believe that contract negotiations have yet to begin on this critical cost element, and that the fundamental question—how much will it actually cost to rent the facilities—remains unanswered at this late date. One wonders how CFA can assert in its publicity materials that these rates will be "affordable", even "low-cost," when union agreements have not been signed. Is it realistic to assume that rental costs will be less than non-union houses run by leaner organizations (e.g., Theater Artaud, Life on the Water)?

Because these promises of affordability have been promulgated for a number of years, CFA should anticipate public relations barriers to overcome when the "real" rates are established. We do not believe that the Center's theater will, in fact, be affordable for some of the groups that it was intended. Aside from the major institutions, there are less than 10 groups (less than a handful of groups of color) we can identify that might be able to sell enough tickets (based on their prior ticket sales results) to justify the rental fees anticipated at the theater (currently guesstimated at \$1,000 per day). Given the set-up costs of the flexible Forum space (24 person-hours of turnaround time at union golden time), renting that space will cost more than renting the similarly sized Cowell Theater.

As an added consideration, some of the groups with whom we spoke (e.g., Paul Dresher Ensemble) who could potentially sell 750 seats, said they would probably prefer a longer run at a smaller house. They pointed out that it made more economic sense for them to perform two consecutive weekends at a smaller house, because they depend on word-of-mouth to generate audiences for the second week.

The issue of rental rates must be carefully evaluated with respect to the marketplace and the mission of the Center. These are not mutually exclusive, but a potential problem could arise if the rental rates are continually higher than most multicultural groups are accustomed to paying. The fact that the theater is more

technically equipped ,and therefore a better value, will not matter if the companies do not have the funds to expend.

Presenting the Performing Arts

Given that the rental rates will, in effect, exclude many groups from using the facility, the only way they will be able to be there will be as presentees subsidized by the Center. What will be the criteria by which local artists are selected, and will they have any input as to how those criteria are established? This is a central policy issue that needs to be addressed now in order to avoid problems down the road. CFA will encounter even more public relations problems if it chooses to take the position that these criteria will be established, *de facto*, by the choices made by the Programming Directors.

There is a potential, and unnecessary, conflict brewing between the Center for the Arts and the local arts community. The Executive Director's insistence in the past on being a presenter, to the extreme of saying that no one would be able to rent the space unless their performances fit within the "aesthetic vision" of the (at that time) yet to be announced Program Director, has run up against the community's feeling that the Center for the Arts ought to be a low-cost rental facility for use by smaller, particularly minority, arts organizations. This conflict hits squarely at the confusion in the community about who the organization was designed to benefit, and how it will go about doing that.

The Theater

In designing the performing arts program some attention should be paid to the Center's desired market niche and some thought given to how it intends to operate within the existing ecosystem of the Bay Area arts environment. Despite CFA's rhetoric to the contrary, other arts organizations are already mining the shafts of multicultural presenting that CFA claims to be opening.

There are no existing local performing arts groups that are not already performing somewhere in the Bay Area. Those groups of the type that Center for the Arts intends to present, those of the highest quality, are in many cases currently being presented by, or appearing at, Cal Performances (2000 seats), Theater Artaud (282 seats), the Cowell Theater (440 seats), or the Palace of Fine Arts Theater (1000 seats). Thus, it is not realistic to assume that heretofore unknown groups are suddenly going to appear on the booking scene. In fact, the Center for the Arts will no doubt reduce the bookings at the smaller houses. Currently, Cowell, Theater Artaud and the Palace of Fine Arts are only booked at about 60% of their annual potential usage.

Cal Performances states that it does not view Center for the Arts as potential competition. In fact, they see CFA as a benefit because Cal Performances can pass along the presentation of local groups to CFA, which it currently subsidizes out of a sense of responsibility to the local performing arts community. Where in this marketplace does Center for the Arts see positioning itself?

Many of the consultants (like many community members) were concerned about the theater size. At 752 seats, it is too large for the majority of small, multicultural organizations, but has too few seats to be a viable commercial success. The 750-seating capacity effectively eliminates the possibility of presenting multicultural groups with a national or international following, such as Kodo, Dance Theater of Harlem, Inti-Illimani, Alvin Ailey, Ballet Folclorico de Mexico, Africa Oye or Ballet Folklorico Quetzali de Veracruz. These groups can fill a 2,300 seat house for a single performance—a much less costly alternative than the three performances they would have to do at the Center for the Arts to generate the same revenue. In short, the 750-seat theater will seriously hamper the Center in meeting its goal of presenting artists of national renown whose performances only begin to reach levels of cost-efficiency in venues with seating capacities of 1,500 or more. The Center will not be a place for blockbuster performances, but rather for such forms as contemporary dance, jazz, recitals, performance art, and comedy.

It will become critical for the Program Director to find the appropriate niche and balance for the center. Included at Appendix E is a list representing sample offerings of multicultural programs that have been presented in houses with seating capacities of 750 to 800. Included at Appendix F is a list of contacts for booking opportunities with multicultural groups. An aid to the new Program Director (coming from Houston) in creating a program plan quickly would be to start to map out the universe of potential work available in the region. This would involve establishing a data base and compiling lists, reviews and materials on local and regional multicultural arts organizations.

The Forum

The multipurpose Forum is a big question mark. As mentioned in the facilities section, its per seat rental cost may be greater than in the theater, due to the crew needed for setup.

The rental potential from non-artistic events, such as meetings, lectures, conferences, cannot be overlooked as a necessary component to the financial success of this project. Not only does this generate needed revenue, but it could expose the facility to segments of the community who might not otherwise come to the facility as arts attenders. The current staff resistance to non-arts related

rentals seems foolhardy. Such rentals do not have to affect the artistic integrity of the The Center or the programs presented by them. On the contrary, this revenue stream could allow the Program Directors more flexibility in creating a program mix that includes artistically significant programs which may have limited audience appeal.

The Forum could generate income as a rental facility for receptions, gala affairs, dinner dances, etc., except that it has no kitchen facilities. This design decision was perhaps a mistake, and may be too late to be altered. Even prestigious East Coast venues such as Lincoln Center rent their lobbies for a wide range of social events. In addition, many ethnic celebrations involve food/feasting as an important component.

The Visual Arts Galleries

While the need for the theater space is questionable, the gallery space will be welcomed in the visual arts community. In San Francisco, both established institutions and alternative spaces tend toward a narrow focus in the kinds of art that they present. Thus, the addition of a gallery that will broaden the landscape of what visual arts audiences get an opportunity to experience will be a valuable contribution to the local cultural scene.

There are many local artists of note that have been working here for years, yet their work is rarely seen in San Francisco, particularly if they are Asian-American. For Native American artists, federal laws create even more barriers to their work being seen. A recent ordinance prohibits the display by any federally-funded entity of the works of art identified as Native American, unless the maker is a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe. More than 50% of California tribes are not federally recognized. (This is a good reason to forego competing for the diminishing NEA funds.)

There is also no major local venue that displays the work from the folk, craft or primitive traditions such as an exhibit of Navajo blankets, Amish quilts or Pomo basketwork. This region has many nationally-recognized contemporary crafts people (e.g. Baulines Craftsman Guild) whose work has not been exhibited in San Francisco.

Thus, CFA can fill important gaps in local visual arts programming. However, the Center's budgeted volume of visual arts programming needs to be reexamined with the aim of building and sustaining an impact as opposed to overwhelming the Bay Area with more programming than can reasonably be absorbed.

Considerable square footage has been allocated to the galleries, which are notorious resource guzzlers and weak producers of income, even if admission is charged. The Center needs to think through the economics of its visual arts presentations. Our sense is that the costs may be higher than budgeted, and the income lower. (At the time of this review, CFA was undecided about whether to charge admissions.) Also, will there be sales of art works with commissions benefiting the Center?

The Media Arts Screening Theater

The film/video screening theater located on the second floor of the Visual Arts Center is designed with a seating capacity of 96. Like its neighbor the Performing Arts Theater, the compromise, mid-range size creates limitations. The size is too small for 35mm exhibitions, which generally require a minimum of 200-400 seats to break-even, and larger than necessary for most of the audiences currently attracted to independently-produced media work. The space is adequate for independent, alternative, non-commercial (16mm) film and video projection and multi-monitor set-ups where audiences size is generally under 100 and an intimate screening experience is desirable.

In the materials we reviewed, there were very few specifics in regard to the proposed programming of this facility. One can infer from categories listed in the expense projections for the screening room—"festival, repertory, tributes, local filmmakers and visual/performing arts"—that a comprehensive program is envisioned. The only Bay Area organization which currently operates such an extensive program is the Pacific Film Archive (PFA) within the University Art Museum at the University of California, Berkeley. PFA has a 234-seat theater, a larger staff, and subsidized support from its affiliation with the University of California, in addition to a built-in student audience. It is not inconceivable that CFA's media programming could be fashioned along PFA lines, but the revenues would probably amount to less than 40% of operating costs.

It is difficult to comment on the income/expense projections because they are not grounded in practical programming considerations. Simply put, the projected revenues from ticket sales (\$50,000) are very ambitious, and rental projections are unrealistic. For example, the projected revenue from rentals will come primarily from full day rentals at \$400 per day (\$12,800 in FY 94, \$20,000 in FY95). Yet there is almost no conceivable market for all-day use of a 96-seat theater because the audience can not be expected to come in a steady stream, and staffing for a full day will not be cost-effective. A half-day or 4-hour evening slot is more likely to be utilized, but the rental fee will have to be much lower, thereby lowering the revenue projections.

The expense figures are somewhat more realistic than the revenue projections, and some of these line items might even be reduced—shipping for instance, if 35mm is not part of the program plan. Expenses based on co-sponsorships, however, were not included and these are a vital component of the overall successful operation of the media facility.

The staffing configuration for this component seems adequate with the exception of when all facilities have a fully booked schedule. This amount of programming will over-extend the technician and the house manager, unless there is part-time help on call.

Education

In the Center's materials, there is scant mention of any role for CFA as an educator or as a presenter of children's programming. Although much discussed in the early planning phase for the Center, the budgets currently do not allocate resources to this function, which we consider critical to the overall goal of the project. In order to successfully engage the audiences of the future—i.e., those that more closely reflect the community who physically live here—a dynamic educational process must occur on both sides. Moreover, the culturally diverse programming must be continually reassessed in relationship to that desired audience.

There is also an adult audience development opportunity in children's programming, especially since many non-dominant cultures hold deep child and family values and tend to socialize with the entire family. Where there is a happy child, there is a satisfied parent. Urban Gateways, Chicago's legendary center for arts in education, could be a good source of information and consultancies should the Center decide to explore this route.

Recommendations

CFA has the opportunity to be a national model in setting the agenda for the shift in consciousness that must come in our way of living with cultural diversity. However, the Center must take a more proactive approach to discussing the issues surrounding cultural diversity if it is to be a real leader in the field. Activities could include: bring together everyone in the country who is working on the same issues that CFA will be facing and pick their brains; produce a monograph to be updated annually; become a national clearing house, a laboratory for finding new approaches to new problems. This kind of programming is fundable, and could help CFA carefully lay the groundwork for creating the organization that it needs to be.

An organization like the Center also has a role to play in creating a bridge between major organizations and less-institutionalized more grassroots ones, and between Western European-based artistic expressions and those of diverse cultures. In this bridge role, two-way mentoring can occur with the major institutions providing professional expertise on a project basis through, for example, internships or consultation, while the community-based organizations can mentor the majors in cross-cultural thinking through advice and consultation.

Performing Arts

The management study team strongly believes that CFA should be both a presenting and rental house, and only by going in that direction will it be able to fulfill its mission, draw audiences to the facility as a space, and help to generate additional audiences for lesser-known groups. But this will take time, perhaps years of development. We do not feel that pursuing this direction as a presenter of quality, multicultural art is mutually exclusive with being a rental house. It is possible to do both, and unless CFA does both, it will have enormous public relations problems, in addition to financial ones.

Given the current timeline in conjunction with the lead-time needed by booking agents, CFA will not have an easy time putting together the opening season. We would recommend CFA consider moving back the opening date, if possible, in order to adequately plan for the important opening year's activities. For reasons of time, and for the more important reasons of mission and public relations, the first season should concentrate on local groups. A first season could provide residencies for already established events such as: the Black Choreographers Festival, the Ethnic Dance Festival, perhaps the Symphony's Wet Ink series, San Francisco Performances' dance presentations, as well as other mini-festivals organized around a theme. For example, several local groups (Paul Dresher Ensemble and Kronos Quartet) are discussing collaborating on their own festival around Margaret Jenkins Dance Company's twentieth anniversary season. We would recommend that CFA take what already exists and work with these groups to build a reputation.

The booking/scheduling model that the Center is currently working with does not adequately allow for traditional theater presentations, which need a minimum of four to six weeks to recoup their productions costs. Some accommodation of theater presentations should be allowed for in the scheduling plan.

It would be interesting to enlist an area theater, such as El Teatro Campesino, to help curate a festival bringing together groups from around the country that they think would be of interest to their own audiences. Other traveling theater

productions are also possibilities: for example, *Juan Darien* played for six weeks to sell-out audiences at Marine's Memorial and could not extend its run because of prior scheduling. There is probably still an audience here for this work which could be shown in combination with Julie Taymor's new film.

One consultant noted that poetry is again in vogue on the East Coast where the "poetry slam" (a kind of amateur night) is the rage at cafes in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. The Forum or the galleries might be venues for this type of programming as well. The Bay Area has an active poetry community that could utilize a bigger venue than the bookstores where most poets read.

Visual Arts

In visual arts, there are provocative historical shows that could be mounted highlighting the work of regional artists of national renown who may not be well known to the local populace, such as the architecture and design work of Julia Morgan, Bernard Maybeck, Arthur and Lucia Matthews. Another exhibit example would be the Multicultural Bay Area in the 1920's, including work by Elizabeth Conrad Hickox, Imogene Cunningham, Yun Gee, Sargent Johnson, and Xavier Martinez. Or CFA could initiate a regional biannual show with catalogue, or a series introducing the mainstream community to multicultural curators in the area.

Instead of producing three relatively expensive catalogues over an annual span of approximately 24 shows, the Center might consider doing more in the way of documentation for each show, e.g. pamphlets, brochures, and modest catalogues. Documentation is possibly the single largest problem for artists outside the mainstream and would afford artists a tangible support for future opportunities. Visitors, particularly with children in tow, often don't have time to read the legends, but would like something to take away with them to read later. Thus, continuous documentation and publications could create an important, effective, component to the general educational function of the visual arts program.

The Center's mission emphasizes its community base, but in practice the Center appears to distance itself from the neighborhood art centers, the very places where this kind of programming has exclusively occurred. By collaborating with the community cultural centers, the Center can effectively use them as potential "feeder" institutions as well as maintaining access bridges to diverse communities. If more of the exhibiting program burden were shifted from neighborhood art centers to Center for the Arts, these centers could focus on the kind of hands-on community interaction that they are best designed to provide.

Media

Because the seating capacity of the screening room renders it not cost-effective to present repertory or first run (35mm) film programming, and because there are more than enough currently existing 35mm-equipped theaters in San Francisco to serve that part of the media community needing this format (e.g., the Castro, Kabuki-8, Roxie, York theaters), we recommend against the installation of 35mm film projectors. Their cost (in the range of \$30,000) will probably not be recovered.

We would, however, recommend that Center for the Arts try to distinguish this facility from other venues by installing state-of-the-art video and audio equipment. For example, install now an excellent stereo-audio system, and an adequate video projection system, and within the next two years invest in the best high definition video projection system available. The technology seems to be on the cusp of a new generation of video resolution and CFA can profit from being among the first to offer it.

We recommend that CFA's media programming attempt to complement that of the existing alternative media community, which will comprise the market for rentals and co-sponsorships. This is the logical way to develop a base audience that is relatively media-sophisticated and willing to attend a range of CFA screenings. We suggest that CFA begin discussions now with local media programmers such as Frameline, Artists Television Access, NAATA, Cine Accion, and San Francisco Cinematheque to ascertain their needs and potential utilization of the facility. In addition, the Center should connect with other arts organizations interested in the moving image, such as Southern Exposure, Galleria de La Raza, and New Langton Arts.

The new Visual and Media Program Director should re-evaluate the film/video component of the operation and develop a more fully articulated and practical approach, and create a realistic budget. In dealing with the media community, CFA should attempt to offer its facilities and services in a way that allows its local arts partners to mutually benefit from successful joint ventures.

Education

The individual consultant team members had numerous ideas in the area of ancillary educational programs, reflecting their belief in the importance of this area. Acknowledging education's high cost, and recognizing no funds for education are in the current budget, these are offered only as ticklers that the

Center might entertain (or not) at some point in its planning process, when the core economic dynamics of the organization have stabilized.

These suggestions included:

- Provide technical assistance for multicultural performers to improve production values and management skills. Develop a real showcase model that goes beyond merely providing space as a rental facility, but seeks to strengthen the production skills of the performing groups.
- Tour component parts of performances and exhibitions to other sites within the immediate region to widen the opportunity for interactive feedback and input from targeted publics.
- Develop internships on a project basis, recruiting from the schools and the community at large to develop individual access to educational and career opportunities in the arts.
- Utilize the existing talent pool in the multicultural community as research associates to develop educational, marketing and publicity materials.
- Target populations through specially designed pamphlets and brochures, and where appropriate translate into other languages.
- Create publications, reports, papers that interface with academic and policy initiatives regarding the expansion of arts programming.
- Create a slide library of the work of regional artists of color that would be a service to artists without institution-affiliation or gallery representation for use by curators, art historians and arts administrators.
- Develop a docent/explainer program to enhance access and understanding.
- Develop a Summer Technical Theater Institute offering talented culturally diverse young people from throughout the nation an intensive theatrical experience.
- Develop a Theater School in collaboration with existing programs to use the Center as a laboratory for all aspects of technical and professional theater for local junior and senior high school students.

Marketing and Audience Development

In the performing arts, the marketing function generally refers to the sale of tickets, while the admission to museums/visual arts spaces is often treated as a membership benefit with the membership revenues carried sometimes as earned revenue, sometimes as contributed revenue. This section will address all sources of earned revenue, as well as audience development activity which may not be revenue-generating.

The Center for the Arts has set for itself a very difficult task—the development of new audiences for the arts—that many organizations have been laboring at for a number of years without much success. A 1982 study conducted by the Center for Public Policy reviewed 270 audience surveys by performing arts organizations across the country over a period of twenty years and found the same basic profile of the arts attender: older, wealthier, better educated and more likely to be Caucasian and in a white collar profession than the general population. The study could find no evidence that audiences were becoming more democratic.

More recent indicators, however, suggest that this may be changing. A recent *New York Times* story on the Metropolitan Museum indicated that by staying open later in the evenings, its audience base was becoming both younger and more diverse. And many professionals in the performing arts characterize the growth area in presenting to be the presentation of culturally diverse work.

The mission statement of the Center and its advance promise of art and culture that is more affordable and more accessible adds a special burden to the marketing task: more time, thought, energy and money will need to be expended in order to generate less revenue (on a per unit basis). Much thought needs to be given to how to successfully involve diverse communities in the Center's activities.

Marketing Planning and Activities

Currently there is no marketing plan. What does exist might be called a "Field of Dreams" marketing approach—just build the hall and the people will come. This was one of Festival 2000's mistakes as well. At the core of both enterprises is the notion that presenting multicultural art is a good thing to do, a cause that should be supported, and therefore will be. Approaching the marketing of performing arts with "good-cause-mind" rather than "what's-in-it-for-the-ticket-buyer-mind" guarantees the kind of uninvolved public response that Festival 2000 received.

Little thought has been given to: who the audience is expected to be, how will they be reached and what will it cost. We acknowledge the difficulty in developing a detailed marketing plan until the actual product has been identified. Indeed, the whole organizational planning has been set back by the absence of a program plan. Nonetheless, more could be done now to move the effort forward. The considerable market research that needs to occur, as well as mailing list development, can begin now.

There is no clear articulation of who the audience is expected to be. Different conversations and documents take different positions on this, none of which constitute a coherent perspective. The staff person currently responsible for marketing advocates taking a passive approach to traditional performing arts audiences, while emphasizing building audiences "community by community," the most difficult and time consuming type of audience development. This kind of audiences development means each show has to be sold on a stand-alone basis. Furthermore, experience in other venues suggests that this strategy will not necessarily result in audience cross-over.

A related question that must be answered is whether specifically targeted ethnic communities are currently attending the work of their own artists in numbers sufficient to support identifying this market segment as a primary audience for CFA. For example, does a local Filipino dance troupe have a sufficient number of Filipino audience members to warrant targeting one's limited marketing dollars at the Filipino community, or is it more cost-effective to first target proven arts attenders from all communities?

It is our belief that CFA's success in developing audiences among diverse communities will be a function, in part, of the degree to which CFA is viewed as an "outsider." For that reason, it is imperative that CFA be able to engender the trust of important contacts within each community who will show CFA the ropes and provide access. If this initial approach is fumbled it may take years to recover "believability." And there is already a large credibility gap that needs to be overcome.

It would be of great value to learn from the mistakes of Festival 2000, the local 1990 multicultural arts festival that closed in bankruptcy half-way through its three weeks of presentations, leaving much bitterness and many unpaid artists in the community. Since a number of the staff and board of the Center for the Arts were also on the board of Festival 2000 it should be possible to do this kind of analysis. Who was the Festival marketing to and how? The experience of Festival 2000 has serious implications for the viability of CFA's venture. At minimum, CFA should interview the team that is studying the issue for additional insight.

CFA needs to think about who the potential customer is and what they will need to know to be comfortable in coming to the Center. This will involve different marketing approaches for the habitual arts attender, the sporadic arts attender, and those who have never attended an arts event. Marketing can be done in advance of the product to familiarize the target audience with the location, parking and restaurant possibilities in the area. Certainly something like the Marketing Alliance would be useful in this regard, but its implementation to date suggests that the Center would be better served by managing its own efforts.

CFA also needs to think through other audience needs, such as how customers will in fact buy the tickets and what other amenities will be available to them. The size and configuration of the box offices do not take into account the volume of activity that will be required. With a new audience for a new space, it may be reasonable to expect more walk-up sales than advance sales.

The organizational materials indicate that CFA will also be trying to attract audiences in the community who will not purchase a ticket at any price. This is both a function of economic ability and of the fact that, in some cultures, participation in cultural events is not viewed as something to be purchased. Therefore, we would recommend that CFA include free events in the opening activities and throughout the year. These could include festival celebrations such as Chinese New Year and Dia de los Muertos, as well as outdoor events.

Earned Income Projections

Current earned income projections assume about one event per week (the opening year is 39 weeks) in each venue which is sold at 60% capacity (on average) with ticket prices averaging from \$18 to \$25 in the theater and from \$5 to \$25 in the Forum. The visual arts admission is \$5 per visit, predicted to generate \$100,000 in revenue from 20,000 visitors over the first 39-week year and \$125,000 in FY 95.

For both the performing arts and visual arts component, we feel that the amount of revenue projected is too ambitious. The film/video screening room income projections are unattainable and do not acknowledge the way in which such work is programmed and marketed. (See Media Programming in the Program Section.)

Our point here is that we question whether enough product exists to book the space, even if it were only rental, and whether enough audience attenders exist to support the space. No consideration appears to have been given as to what the impact will be on the local arts economy (including CFA) when CFA's thousands of tickets are added to those currently being sold annually to other local performing arts events: according to the Center's projections, close to 30,000

tickets for the theater alone (the first, 39-week, year), not including the Forum, the gallery, or the media component. Ironically, this large increase in product is projected at a time when many arts organizations are experiencing serious downtrends in their ticket sales, particularly in subscription sales.

The ticket price ranges currently budgeted vary by discipline and range from a \$6 dance rush ticket to \$35 to attend a music event. We would suggest both a wider ticket range, with more low-end ticket options, and also a rethinking of the discount policy. Rather than seniors and students, CFA might want to think of discounts for other target beneficiaries. Senior and students are generally discounted because they are considered to have less disposable income. However, statistically, seniors have higher incomes, particularly the arts attender segment, and students seem to have the disposable income to pay very high ticket prices for popular music events.

The theater revenue is currently budgeted at from 40% to 90% of capacity, with the higher percentage figured for the more costly events and the lowest percentage for the low-end events. Since this is only a hypothetical model, we would recommend using a simpler model based on an average percentage capacity for all presentations and eliminating the breakout by discipline at this juncture. For example, the Center's current model averages out to an average capacity for the theater (751 seats) of 57% in FY 94 and 62% in FY 95. It is unclear why fewer events are being presented in FY95 (29 events/123 performances) than in FY 94 (31 events/129 performances). With the amount and type of product being presented in this size venue, we would not recommend budgeting at greater than 50% capacity in FY94 and less than that in FY95 when the novelty of the new building has worn off for the one-time, look-and-see audience.

For the Forum, with a 300 to 450 seating capacity, ticket prices range from \$5 for a lecture to \$10 to \$25 for a performance. Again, we would recommend lowering this price range. It might be instructive to consult with other venues like New Performance Gallery for both the ticket price range and the potential audiences for contemporary dance. We predict that it is considerably less than the figures projected here.

It will take years to develop an audience of the size and consistency needed to fulfill the Center's presenting schedule at the levels projected in the current budgets. In the words of several commenters, these earned income figures are "wildly optimistic" and "pie in the sky."

The Costs of Marketing

In our experience there is no monolithic multicultural audience. In fact, the programming CFA is anticipating doing will involve marketing to many different audiences, and there may not be a lot of audience cross-over. The task is complicated, time-consuming, and more costly than routine arts marketing.

The marketing expenses to generate ticket sales are currently budgeted on a pro forma mainstream arts model with ads in the major papers, press releases and post cards sent for each weekly performance. We would strongly urge using a variety of approaches instead, as recommended below. It is unclear why there are weekly mailings and receptions planned. We question whether there will be the staff in place to produce all these functions and, if so, will they need to be paid overtime expenses? Some of FY 95 expenses are booked at 5% increases and some at 6% with no rationale provided.

Financially, the marketing costs of essentially building a new audience for each show are drastically underestimated. There will be no halo effect from a consistent art form or performers. Further, the cost in effort, energy, and time to build audiences in this way also appears to have been severely underestimated.

For the visual arts galleries, we would suggest that the catalogues that are envisioned be treated as educational program expenses and not promotion expenses. We also feel that CFA is underestimating the time it takes to correctly produce such catalogues (24 catalogues are planned for the opening year).

Staffing for the Marketing Function

The staffing design is further evidence that the Center does not understand the immensity of the marketing task before it. The minimal references to marketing in job descriptions (e.g., no one has "marketing" in a job title) suggests the primacy of public relations in institutional thinking to the detriment of the sales-orientation necessary to do solid marketing, let alone meet the formidable sales challenges the Center has set for itself.

Marketing Materials

The Center for the Arts' name, logo, and materials are poorly conceived, in that they do not convey the product or the mission that CFA is endeavoring to sell. This is an immensely important element, and it is critical that the Center rethink their marketing image in the context of the organizational mission.

Recommendations:

Marketing Activities

Hire a person with marketing expertise. Marketing, particularly at the Center for the Arts, requires the skills of a thoughtful professional. There are few arts managers with real strength in this area, in part, because the for-profit sector pays a much higher premium for this expertise. Finding the appropriate Marketing Director may be the hardest job to fill in the organization.

We would recommend that you begin now to work with the local communities to understand the methods of audience development that have and have not been successful with their audiences. Different cultural groups communicate among themselves differently, utilize their community organizations differently, and relate to the dominant cultural with different assumptions. Therefore developing audiences among these diverse populations will involve great sensitivity and potentially different methodologies. These might include: advertisements in different language newspapers; more emphasis on radio than print media; greater use of alternative media (KPFA instead of the Chronicle); and working through existing social and/or community organizations. These approaches involve as much leg power as cash power, and they create an opportunity for the effective use of interns and, at a later date, community volunteers.

We also recommend that CFA create an advisory group of consultants from each of the initial target communities. These should be representatives from those cultures who are currently producing art and marketing it. This group should be paid (at least an honorarium of significance), and could be utilized individually, as well as a group. Used correctly, they could save CFA enormous time and energy by allowing the Center to benefit from the expertise they have already accrued. But, this absolutely must be paid for, otherwise CFA will demean the consultants' expertise and create the feeling of trying to rip off the community. CFA should also connect with the neighborhood cultural centers as points of access to potential audiences.

It is recommended that a number of subscription series be developed and targeted toward specific audience segments. It could be reasonably anticipated that some subscribers will purchase more than one series as long as the price is reasonably set to reflect the current marketplace of the particular artform. Ticket purchasing must be easy, accessible, and sensitive to the ethnic diversity of the constituency CFA hopes to serve.

Consider innovative ways to market block or group sales to target audiences at significant savings to be offered through existing organizations serving that

group. If these are made attractive enough, "safety in numbers" might draw people from the communities who wouldn't otherwise attend.

Budgeting

In rebudgeting the earned income projections, we suggest CFA take these steps: simplify the ticket revenue model (we have provided one example of how to do this at Appendix G); provide lower priced ticket options in each range; reduce the amount of product offered; reduce the percentage of capacity anticipated; and rethink the visual arts component in terms of admissions and anticipated audience.

We would recommend setting up systems now that easily allow for the tracking and analysis of data. For example, the marketing cost per ticket sold, per venue, as well as a way to do cost-analysis on different methodologies that are tried.

Ancillary Earned Income

It is our understanding that earned revenues from rentals, concessions, bookstore, cafe and restaurant are under the jurisdiction of the Operations Director. We would recommend that the bookstore be considered a component of the artistic program and coordinated by the Program Directors in conjunction with the Operations Director.

The bookstore is not currently budgeted to be revenue-generating, but is anticipated to be leased out to a commercial book seller. We recommend that CFA retain the bookstore in-house, and that it be treated as a revenue-generating component of program activities. This will require hiring consultants on museum shop operations and additional staff, but presumably this can be deducted from the revenues. Staffing, inventory, and start-up costs need to be analyzed, and a phased schedule of operations should be developed to ensure that enough foot traffic exists to warrant the opening of the store.

We do not recommend that CFA undertake to run either the restaurant or the cafe, as neither are tax-deductible activities and both are difficult to run at a profit. We are concerned about who will use the cafe during the initial years after opening, while later, the space may be too small. The hours of operation need to be thought out in relation to the external environment, i.e., CFA events, daytime foot traffic, security at night, etc.

Other Recommendations

In addition to the recommendations noted above, the management team strongly urges CFA to undertake the following actions:

- Begin to black out dates for CFA's use so rentals can be offered to others;
- Create a data base on potential regional users;
- Establish the rental cost and develop a rental policy, and present it to the community;
- Rethink the logo and the look that Center for the Arts projects to the public;
- Develop a written detailed marketing plan that ties in with budget figures.

Public, Community, and Constituent Relations

Organizations communicate with the external world primarily through either face-to-face spoken communications or by means of the written word in brochures, press releases, grant proposals, and other written documents. The Center for the Arts' communications have been less than adequate in both modes, thereby creating a perennial and intractable public relations problem.

After intensely involving the arts community for years in its public planning process, the project ceased communicating in any formal way with the public after professional staff was hired. Over the course of the last three years, as staff's vision for the Center (a quality, regional and international presenter) veered from the vision of many in the community (a subsidized rental facility), an almost adversarial relationship has developed with some segments of the arts community. This has been exacerbated by the intense political arena in which the project operates. In defense, the CFA staff has adopted a sort of "bunker mentality" which seems to have worked against its developing an appropriate network within the community, establishing collegial relationships with peer presenters, arts managers, funders or potential constituent facility-users, or even attending the type of work they might present.

The general feedback we heard from the community is that there is considerable skepticism about whether the project will ever happen, a lack of clarity about what it will do and for whom, and a feeling that it will be an expensive, political boondoggle. It is already too frequently characterized as "the next Festival 2000 waiting to happen."

A sampling of the kind of comments made include:

"Local Groups won't be able to afford the space unless their performances are subsidized. Don't they know that presenting is costly? Where will the money come from?"

"YBC is dedicated to the 'community,' but who is the community? The community is the last to be informed."

"Jerry is not out there in the community."

"YBC is not engaged with the community."

"YBC is not in touch with the community, is not in tune with the finances of the '90s, and the initial impetus to have it built is no longer applicable."

"YBC will not be a rental space, only a presenter. Jerry has told us not to count on using the space, and he is smug about it."

"People were approached some time ago, but no one is really talking business. Groups in town are ready to talk about booking the hall, but there's no one to talk to."

The printed image of itself that the Center has disseminated is likewise inadequate to the task. Both the graphics and the copy fail to convey the organization's mission to the reader. Furthermore, the organization has positioned itself in its press materials, brochures and fundraising campaign strategy as: "The most ambitious and first interdisciplinary institution of its kind in the nation." This is just not true and to continue to assert such hyperbole is to undercut the case among those people who are most likely to support the Center.

There are many institutions around the country which have multiple performing spaces in combination with visual and media arts facilities. (See chart at Appendix D for some comparisons.) Many of these are centrally located, some have larger budgets, and most are presenting multicultural and experimental work in some combination with traditional work. To assert, as the Executive Director does, that the Center will map out this terrain, when it is already being surveyed in some depth, even locally, is to again raise the issue of: "Does the Center know what it is doing?"

From the materials reviewed, what this project has been selling is an expected reaction, not a product. Claims of "avant garde, experimental, cutting-edge, world-class, beacon world-wide, and high quality" are words used to describe the effect of a product, not the product. Without a product, who knows what the effect will be? To sell an anticipated effect is risky, and the chances for failure are heightened. The organization continues to promise more than it can deliver, certainly more than it has the budget for or a plan to make happen.

Many of the consultants regretted the name change from Yerba Buena Cultural Center to the Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens, and felt it signaled to the community a lack of understanding of the Center's own mission. The name "Yerba Buena" is a cultural reference to an important segment of the population and highlights a critical dimension of the regional history. "Cultural Center" acknowledges this community base and reflects a vote with the national debate on the semantics of art vs. culture, with "culture" being the broader, more inclusive term. Also, on a strictly pragmatic level, everyone we spoke with continues to call the project "YBC."

The name "Center for the Arts" suggests a pre-packaged, disembodied facility without a regional identity. According to the Executive Director, this name was selected because of its "vanilla flavor." Further, he stated that "arts center" was preferred to "cultural center," as a conscious attempt to distance the Center from

the neighborhood cultural centers, because the Center was to be about quality. The institution, which claims to have multiculturalism as its primary mission, seems to have missed the most obvious points in the current national discussion about multiculturalism.

Another example of the offense and confusion that the Center creates in its written materials is the recent job announcements for both Director of Performing Arts and Director of Visual/ Media Arts. In these job descriptions the principles and skills necessary to effect culturally diverse programming are almost completely lacking. Minimum requirements address a "demonstrated commitment" and "sensitivity" to these issues. If diversity is the component that will make the Center unique, than expertise, indeed national leadership, in cultural and artistic diversity would appear to be the *sine qua non* of the appropriate Program Directors. Further, the job descriptions speak to "a high quality professional staff" in a way that reasserts the argument that diversity and quality are mutually exclusive.

The issues of context and criteria—What is art? What is quality?—are at the heart of the exclusion of many American cultures. Thus, while the contrast and celebration of cultural diversity are positive ways in which a fuller understanding of society may be enhanced, the **comparison** of cultures (as called for in the Executive Director's position statement) seems in no way to promote the spirit of support the Center should be providing to all cultures. It is important that the desire to compare dominant vs. non-dominant cultural expressions in ways that have historically begged a hostile reaction to the inequities that are inevitably revealed be eliminated. The complexity of cultural identity, history and coexistence must be nurtured through a non-judgmental acceptance and presentation of materials based on expanded, critical standards.

Recommendations

Our primary recommendation in this area echoes the points outlined earlier in this report in the "Mission" section: CFA needs to decide who it is and what is it trying to do. Without knowing this clearly, all communications may result in confusion and will certainly be less than effective.

We suggest CFA revisit the organizational name, logo, and graphic image. Consider a look in tone and in copy that is less corporate and more populist, fluid, creative. Toward this end, we would further recommend that CFA hire a writer and destroy all previously written materials that do not accurately reflect what CFA is.

We recommend that the staff and board "get out of the bunker" and talk to people. This includes visiting other organizations' spaces/offices, attending performances of the anticipated user-constituency, and developing personal (i.e., person-to-person, not organization-to-organization) relationships throughout the arts community.

Fundraising

It is extremely difficult to raise money for new ideas. The fact that the project's impetus arose from a real estate transaction, combined with the continual delays in implementation, has added an additional layer of difficulty for the project in terms of fundraising. It has been hard for the Board to begin to believe that the project will actually happen, and to take its fundraising role seriously. An additional complicating factor is that the Board, as initially envisioned, was not to be a fundraising board, but rather a sort of quasi-governmental oversight committee. The transition to a full-fledged fundraising board is still occurring, and there remain people on the Board who are not yet fully committed to the fundraising tasks. The fundraising capacity is further hampered by a lack of clear understanding of the mission statement and a perceived lack of consensus about what the organization will be.

The Fundraising Goals

The current four-year (FY92-FY95) campaign goal is \$10.6 million. This figure is based as much on desire as on need, containing as it does \$4 million for capital (when it is conceivable that the Center could and will open with less); \$5.5 million for operating in the first two years (based on plugged numbers and wish-fulfillment); and \$1.5 million for an endowment (which is not needed at this time).

It is unclear why the fundraising target was set so high, and in our opinion this was ill-advised. Indeed, a feasibility study completed in 1990 cautioned that a target of \$6.9 million would be difficult to achieve. Surprisingly, at the time of our review (two years after the study was completed), few of the concerns raised in the feasibility study seemed to have been addressed. That study stated: "It is difficult to identify any real enthusiasm for supporting the forthcoming campaign in anything but token fashion. There are a few exceptions to this conclusion but not many." It went on to say that some Board members "believe that there is no need to wage a capital campaign focused on building and equipment funds. They are convinced that the necessary funds are available from the Redevelopment Agency."

The historical sequence of how the organization, begun in 1986, arrived at its current fundraising task is worth reviewing. As originally designed the Center for the Arts was not to have a fundraising board. Even now, the mandatory qualifications for Directors at Large are only: a) a primary interest in promoting the arts or knowledge and experience in promoting the arts; and b)

a willingness to devote an appropriate amount of time to carrying out the duties of a Director.

At various stages, it appeared that the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency would not be able to fund the buildings as planned. For some time it was unclear whether both facilities would be built. Later, the figure of \$1.9 million emerged as the shortfall need to be made up to have the project completed. At this juncture, the board of Center for the Arts pledged to raise the \$1.9 million. According to the contractual agreement between the SFRA and the Center for the Arts, this \$1.9 million "must be collected or pledged. . . by January 1, 1991" or "the Agency in its sole discretion may delete the Forum from the design and construction of the Visual Arts Center." It was further agreed that the Center, if it had not raised the necessary funds, could have monies transferred from the equipment fund to complete the Visual Arts Center. CFA would then be responsible for the equipment, which presumably would come on line at a later date. This is the situation at this juncture.

Across time, for reasons that are not entirely clear, the campaign target goal kept slipping upwards from \$1.9 million in 1988 to \$6.9 million in 1989 to \$10.6 million in 1991 (see Chart at Appendix H). What is clear is that these goals were not tied to any realistic planning on the expense side, or realistic assessment of the project's fundraising potential on the income side. There is absolutely no evidence that this goal is achievable within the timeframe of the campaign.

Furthermore, the unrealistically high goal, combined with its upward drift, has served to undermine the fundraising credibility of the organization within the funding community. Setting an unachievable goal also undermines the confidence of the board fundraisers and creates an atmosphere where no one ever expects to be successful. It is far better to set manageable goals, based on what it really takes to do the project, and give the solicitors the possibility of success and the chance to feel a sense of accomplishment.

The Strategy/The Approach

The Campaign Plan is embodied in a 20-page document written in December 1991. It is a standard, generic fundraising pro forma and does not address the particular barriers that this project faces. The classic pyramid-type fundraising outlined in the plan is inappropriate, and therefore unfeasible, for an organization with no product and no broad base of support.

Our analysis is that until the building is open and programming is in place it will be difficult to raise money for anything other than capital expenses. To focus on operating and endowment at this juncture is premature. Why would

someone endow something that does not even exist, much less has proven itself?

In general, people do not give to presenting houses, let alone city facilities. Without a proven program and an identifiable constituency, it will be very difficult to raise operating funds from foundations, corporations and most individual donors. To think of doing a small-donor direct mail/telefunding appeal before the building has opened is a waste of funds.

The management team found the campaign plan particularly offensive in its "ghetto-izing of donors" by approaching different ethnic groups to give money that will be spent on arts programming of their ethnicity. It is our opinion that this approach undercuts the cultural pluralism thrust of the mission statement by an unnecessary (and unhealthy) balkanization of the donor pool. But, more importantly, this will NOT work. It makes the assumption (which community experience has proven to be erroneous) that the various ethnic/racial groups will want to support their own ethnic art as presented by Center for the Arts. In our experience when these groups give (and it is not in their tradition to give to the arts) they give to support their own performing arts organizations. There are exceptions, of course. For example, African Americans may sometimes support a single exhibition of the work of a prominent artist at a "mainstream" institution, but the support is usually short-term and not very significant financially. We recommend that CFA assume major support will NOT come from "multicultural and ethnic individuals and businesses."

What makes the current CFA campaign unfeasible is that: 1) the goal is fictitious, and not tied to a real need. 2) the project is not articulated clearly enough to sell in the abstract; 3) when correctly articulated, multiculturalism (i.e. power sharing) may not be something that will necessarily appeal to the traditional wealthy, upper class white donor; 4) the project is coming on line at a time of intense capital fundraising competition in the community. More than 25 local capital campaigns (with goals totalling more than \$550 million) are currently in progress led by sophisticated organizations that have spent years in cultivating the loyalty and commitment of their donors; 5) It will always be a difficult sell to get donors to give to what may be perceived as a government agency; 6) given the history of this project, those most closely aligned with the arts community, and therefore most likely to give, may well be the most skeptical; 7) the current board does not have the contacts to identify sufficient donors at the levels charted; 8) the current board does not have the people resources willing and able to approach this many donors in the time frame needed, even assuming the potential donors might give. (For example, the campaign plan calls for CFA's board to approach nearly 300 donors at the \$25,000 - \$1 million + level.) In the short term, the Center has

not set realistic goals and timelines to allow the appropriate "cultivation" period to occur.

The Results to Date

Since CFA's founding in 1986, \$30,553 has been received in contributions. An additional \$221,164 has been pledged for payment over the next three years. \$417,846 will have been spent in fundraising costs by June 30, 1992, leaving a net loss of \$166,129 for the fundraising effort. A start-up organization may incur costs that are never recouped, but the expenses in this area need to be carefully evaluated.

It is unfortunate that the significance of what has been accomplished to date has been diminished in comparison with the \$10.6 million goal. The Development Committee seems to be on track, with its initial solicitation of the board, and the Corporate Circle is beginning to come together, but these things take time. And while the Board could do more, too much blame for the fundraising problems has been aimed at the Board by the CFA staff and the Agency.

In a similar vein, the Board should not be looked on as the primary funding source. Again, the product is key to revenue generation, whether it is earned income or contributed income. The Board should believe in the product enough to sell it and to support it, but they should not be expected to do it all.

Fundraising is not mysterious. In evaluating the likelihood of success, one needs to ascertain what is pending. Take for example the current fiscal year due to end June 30, 1992, three months away. The goal for this FY is \$2,200,000, of which \$29,553 has been received. Surprisingly, both the Executive Director and the Development Director continue to cling to a belief that this fundraising goal is achievable.

It might be helpful to review, source by source, what is possible:

- **Board Gifts**

The board will continue its solicitation of itself toward its three-year goal of \$500,000. With 85% of the board solicited, 54% have pledged \$221,164 over the next three years. Assuming this goal is met by June 30, a potential additional \$330,000 must be pledged from the remaining 15% of the board to be paid out over the next three years.

- **Foundations Grants**

There are no private foundation requests pending at this time, and in fact the Center recently received a lengthy rejection letter from the San Francisco

Foundation (targeted at \$75,000) explaining in detail its concerns about the project. Other foundations have indicated that they are not interested in giving until they can see what the program will be. With no proposals pending and given the turnaround time needed to process foundation requests, it is predicted that this source will yield no funds toward this year's goal.

- Corporations

A Corporate Council has been formed, headed by a capable banking executive with contacts in the business community. A \$250,000 grant request is pending with his corporation, the Bank of America. Both he and staff have begun a series of corporate cultivation events, but no additional formal proposals are pending. Given that the target amount for the other corporate donors is \$2,000, it seems unlikely that BOA will fund at the full amount of the request but, given that there is a personal relationship, it is not impossible.

- Individuals

Major donor identification is just beginning. No assignments of prospects have been made to individual board solicitors. Therefore, no additional funds are anticipated from this source.

- Government

No proposals have been submitted to date.

Given the above, the best case scenario against this fiscal year's annual goal of \$2,200,000 is \$250,000 (BOA), plus the \$29,553 in hand, plus \$54,833 in payments made on board pledges, for a total of \$334,366 or 15% of goal. The staff's blind defense of achievability of the \$2,200,000 goal raises concerns about the organization's professional fundraising expertise.

What is of concern is not only the unrealistic projections, based on a rejection of the organization's own feasibility study and common sense, but also the unwillingness of staff and board to be truthful about the implications for the future of the progress to date.

Board Support of Fundraising

The board set for itself a three-year goal of \$500,000. With approximately 85% of the board solicited, \$247,994 has been pledged or received. Given the nature of the project, the composition of the Board, and the current Bay Area fundraising climate, this is a notable achievement. Staff members did express disappointment with key Board officers who pledged token contributions at a level beneath that which the staff itself was capable of contributing.

While the staff had complaints against its fledgling board, some of which were justified, the management team observed real commitment and a greater sense of the potential significance of the organization among the Board members we spoke with than among the staff. The Board still lacks consensus about its goals, but it is beginning to work together as a board.

Everyone acknowledges that the Board is not a fundraising board. Yet all the projections and assumptions are predicated on having a fully-functioning, dedicated and experienced fundraising board—right now. This is not something one just goes out and gets because one wants it. It requires a combination of vision, commitment, leadership and nurturing over time. A good start has been made, but it seems unlikely that the Board can cultivate the resources needed in the timeframe of this campaign.

The task for the Board that goes hand-in-hand with fundraising is board development. The 1990 feasibility study noted "a limited financial acumen and experienced management represented on the Board" that was a detriment to fundraising from the corporate community who "expect assurances that the project is fundamentally sound, both in concept and in management. . . . The fact that there are so few leaders from the business community on the Board causes some unease among not only corporate gift prospects but individuals and foundations as well who will be asked to support an organization that has no proven track record. They are less than fully confident the the Cultural Center will be able to achieve financial stability as well as artistic success. Further, most of the Operating Board members themselves have limited financial 'clout.' Beyond that, all but a very few of them have little direct access to others whose gift support could make major inroads in the \$6.9 million [now \$10.6 million] challenge represented in the campaign goal." This characterization is still essentially accurate and should be a consideration in the process of board development.

Staff for Fundraising Tasks

The fundraising function was slow to get off the ground on the staff level as well. The first Development Director, hired in December 1989 was fired in 1990. Among other things, he spent \$20,000 to have an outside firm write a 12 page "Case Statement" that was never used. The department was staffed by a Development Assistant as well. During this tenure, no funds were raised, although \$99,984 was spent in fundraising costs (FY90). The current Director was hired in November 1990, and the Development Assistant became the Research Associate. In addition, an outside fundraising consulting firm was retained at an annual fee of \$79,000. Under the current Director, in FY 91, \$1,000 was raised and \$97,864 was spent in fundraising costs. For the current

fiscal year ending June 30, 1992, \$29,553 has been received against a goal of \$2.2 million, with \$220,000 budgeted to be spent on fundraising expenses.

Start-up costs are necessary, but the projected fundraising costs need to be re-evaluated in light of the results to date. The Development Director is budgeted to hire four additional staff by the end of the current fiscal year: 1) an Associate Director of Development; 2) a Manager of Institutional Gifts; 3) a Manager of Individual Gifts; 4) and a Development Assistant (to replace the Research Associate who quit). Since, to date, there are no institutional gifts or major gifts (aside from Board pledges), we would recommend against proceeding in this direction. We would suggest that other staff resources become involved in the fundraising campaign, particularly the Administrative Director who has skills in this area, before additional staff is hired.

The Executive Director also is not sufficiently involved in the fundraising effort. Development staff's job is to correctly place the Executive Director and the Board at the right solicitation effort, not to subvert their participation and involvement. Two excerpts from foundation interviews illustrate this point:

One foundation officer complained of being approached exclusively by development staff: "Where is the Executive Director? He has been here for years, and I don't know anyone in the foundation community who has met him. I've already had dinner with the new superintendent of schools and he just got to town last week." A second foundation arts program officer reiterated the complaint: "I have to call him [Executive Director] for meetings to find out what's going on. The only times I have met with him were at my instigation."

The image of disarray that the Center's materials project may also serve to keep prospective funders at arm's length. The printed materials being used by the development office were found by the team to suffer from the same lack of comprehensibility as those used throughout the organization. In the words of a foundation executive: "They sent in the worst proposal (for the best idea) that I have seen from an arts and culture applicant in the last twelve years. And, you can quote me on that."

The personal style and attitude of the Development Director seems particularly ill-suited, if not damaging, to the campaign effort. Her characterization of what she has to sell as "cheap naming-opportunities and guilt", is extraordinarily offensive. A gift of \$2.5 million is hardly "cheap" and to be characterized as such by a recipient could only be insulting to a potential donor. Even the document labeled, "Case for Campaign: Notes from the Board Workshops" lists "guilt" and "ego" as attractions for individual

donors. In describing the ethnic targeting of the campaign plan, she confesses that "of course, some minorities are more equal than others." Someone with a sincere, personal commitment to the organization's mission, preferably a person of color, would be more appropriate in this position.

Recommendations

The fundraising goals need to be re-formulated. What is the real need and what is realistically possible? There is a continuously dynamic feedback process necessary to the effective management of all organizations. One plans based on a certain set of assumptions, one implements those plans and then evaluates that implementation; based on the information derived one proceeds to reformulate the initial assumptions. In this organization, staff continues to cling blindly to their original contributed income projections despite all evidence that these goals cannot be met. This kind of thinking could be fatal to the organization.

In our analysis, the campaign plan as currently conceived is guaranteed to fail. It is a textbook scheme, in a far-from-textbook environment. Rather than the scatter-shot approach outlined there, the focus until the opening should be on: 1) naming opportunities for the facility solicited from individual major donors; and 2) underwriting for opening events, particularly from corporations. We predict that it is highly unlikely that government, foundation or small donor gifts will be forthcoming until the facility is open, and they have had an opportunity to see for themselves what the Center offers.

The Board should conduct a functional inventory of the skills it needs, as well as evaluating the effectiveness of its current membership, and make additions and deletions now without waiting for ineffective board members to cycle off. The characterization of the Board articulated in the feasibility study is, essentially, still accurate, and the concerns noted there should guide the organization in its board development efforts

The entire staff needs to be involved in the fundraising effort. At the same time, the management team strongly recommends CFA re-evaluate staff adequacy to the fundraising task, as well as the need for campaign consultants or additional development staff. We would recommend CFA hire a good writer to be responsible for all the organization's written materials.

We also suggest CFA conduct exit interviews with departing staff. The departing Research Associate stated that the corporate goals were set at five times what in her opinion were realistically predictable results.

Governance

Board Structure

As discussed in the Introduction, the governance function is hampered by the extent to which the Board operates as a quasi-governmental entity. This sense is reinforced by bylaw requirements of: 1) a mayor's representative on the Board; 2) SFRA agency representatives on the Board; 3) a developer's representative on the Board; 4) Board meetings being open to the public; 5) the Agency's budget approval powers (among others), and the fact of its current, 100%-government funding. These factors work against the Board's capacity to function as a truly independent organization, to feel the urgency of its fundraising requirements, and to take real ownership of the organization.

The Board's structure will always be an anomaly, and, due to that structure, its accountability will be blurred. The degree of the Board's independence or ownership will be in dynamic relationship to the money that they are able to raise, and the community support that they are able to earn.

Board's Understanding of its Role

The bylaws call for a community board of those with "knowledge of arts promotion," based on the original conception of the organization as only a rental facility. The shift to a presenting role for Center for the Arts, with its consequent need for additional money, has shifted the functional needs of the Board to those of fundraising. Thus, the Board, as currently constituted, is a curious mix of the original model of a more community-based, grass-roots board and the more institutional model of a fundraising board used by the major arts organizations, with a handful of political appointees thrown in.

It does not seem plausible that either model will produce the level of support needed to realize the current programming design. What is equally troubling is that the Board does not seem to question the assumptions that have created the shape of the organization as it exists today. Two critical clauses from the CFA's operating agreement are worth underscoring here: 1) The Agency has no obligation to fund the programming or community involvement activities of the Operator; and 2) the Operator will make its best effort to achieve certain programming objectives, including: providing facilities at reasonable or, in some instances, at reduced or nominal rental charges.

At its current stage of development, and in part due to these shifts in functional need, the Board has not yet jelled into a unified working body, although that

potential does exist. Titular leadership is ineffective by all accounts. In fact, the Board President and the Executive Director barely speak to one another, and both have committed serious process errors by acting unilaterally without informing the other. Likewise, committee decisions have been made out-of-hand by a few members without duly called meetings.

A review of the minutes of the last year's bi-monthly Board meetings, indicated an attendance rate of 58% by board members. Furthermore, after six years and a Board policy of 100% participation in fundraising, only 54% of the Board has pledged to contribute to the organization, and fewer have actually made donations.

These statistics, however, do not adequately reflect the countless thousands of volunteer hours (and several substantial pledges) that have been directed toward this project, particularly in the last six years. Much of the mechanics of board operation is correctly in place: committees meet, minutes are kept, policy decisions are made, the finances are being tracked, and much work is accomplished.

There are committed, hard working, intelligent Board members, some of whom have a greater grasp of the mission and the organization's potential than staff. These are not yet one group, however, and work needs to be done to bring the Board's talent together, jointly working for the best interests of clearly agreed-upon mission, goals, and objectives.

Given the peculiarities of non-profit management, this is an adequate Board, even a good Board. But more is needed. Despite all the activity, no one is asking, or more significantly answering, what Peter Drucker calls the three important questions: 1) What is our product?; 2) Who are our customers?; 3) Do our customers perceive the product we are offering to be of value?

Board Composition

If the goal of the organization is to be 1/3 funded by contributed income, more thought needs to be given to bringing on board members with a proven track record in fundraising and annual giving, but again the commitment to the project is what will fuel this effort.

Furthermore, while fundraising skills and connections are needed, equally important at this juncture is an understanding of presenting organizations, and connections with the communities and constituents that CFA intends to serve. It does not appear that there are any representatives of the potential client base on the Board. How does the Board intend to keep itself informed about the changing

needs and interests of the local arts-producing organizations, other than what it is told by the staff?

For an organization whose mission is cultural diversity, we would recommend that its Board (and staff) at all times contain a clear majority of people of color. This figure has grown from 24% six years ago to nearly 50% today, but more needs to be done to engage the culturally diverse members in charting the organizations future. But simply being of African, Asian, or Hispanic descent is not enough. It is important that the Board seek out people committed to cultural pluralism who are interested in learning about issues of multiculturalism.

Recommendations

As this report indicates, there is a lack on the Board of substantive knowledge of the kind of organization that is being launched. Without this knowledge-base it will be difficult for the board to properly evaluate the organization's strategies, establish appropriate benchmarks for its accomplishments, or to effectively evaluate staff performance. The Board should do a functional needs analysis of its membership and look to add new members that possess the expertise and connections that CFA needs at this stage in its development. Additionally, the Board should consider a by-law change that will not cycle off members after six years. The organization is too fragile at this point in its development to lose all of its institutional memory at this critical, pre-opening juncture.

The Board has a responsibility to ask the "hard questions," not only about management of the Center, but about its own performance as well. Toward this end, we would recommend the Board re-evaluate current Board members' individual effectiveness, and the overall direction of the organization. We would also recommend the development, discussion and implementation of a Board level conflict-of-interest policy. Additionally, the Board should be looking to its future by actively recruiting its leadership and planning for leadership succession.

Besides financial and fundraising accountability, the board members have a role of sustaining public trust, promoting the organization in the broader community, and being a "eyes-and-ears feedback loop" from their individual communities back into the organization. The Board needs to interact more directly with the constituent community—attend their events, meet the key players, and develop a contextural base from which to evaluate what CFA does.

The by-laws currently allow the master developer to appoint two board positions. Since Olympia and York is no longer the master developer, the Center may want to change this arrangement.

Management

There is no substitute for good leadership. Leadership is more important to the success of a start-up effort than even the original concept. There is no evidence of a leadership team here, and little evidence to convince the management auditors that decisions are being made in a careful, reasoned way with adequate information.

Planning

One of the most striking aspects of this project is that nowhere is there any evidence of a strategy for incremental growth. This Center has been envisioned as an instant success—a major arts center, with large, loyal audiences and generous funders. But, an enterprise of this sort must be phased-in and allowances must be made for plateaus from which its trajectory and performance can be assessed. There is no evidence that this has been done.

While there is a document labeled "Strategic Plan" it is neither a plan nor strategic. At best, it could be called a situational analysis, but it is riddled with inaccuracies and internal inconsistencies. This so-called "Strategic Plan" contains no goals, no objectives, no budget, no timeline and no workplan.

The management study team was frankly incredulous that we would be hired to review this document as the plan for the organization. It suggests a dangerous "emperor's-new-clothes" phenomenon, and points to a troubling organizational characteristic of not acknowledging reality.

What is even more puzzling about the organization's lack of a plan is: 1) during three years with professional staff, planning was presumably the primary focus, since programming had not occurred; and 2) section 4.04 of the operating agreement with the Redevelopment Agency requires that a plan be submitted to the Agency twelve months prior to completion of the building (currently estimated at June 1993). Thus, a long range plan will need to go to the Agency by June 1992, less than three months away. An adequate planning process usually takes six months to a year to complete.

Staffing

Current Staffing Structure

Curiously, the current staff has too many people, yet not enough functions covered. The overwhelming consensus of the management team was that the staff

is bloated in relation to the current level of programmatic activity. While in interviews many of the staff reported feeling overworked, it was difficult, in some cases, to ascertain what work was actually being done.

The majority of the staff are managers. There are "too many Chiefs and not enough Indians." The current staff structure is not well-designed for efficiency, teamwork or maximum utilization of ability. Staff positions do not appear to have been added organically, as the work load increased. Rather, it appears that staff was hired to figure out what to do, and staff members proceeded to stake out their individual territory within the organization.

The effectiveness of the current staff structure has also suffered from a lack of supervision and overview. To judge from the Executive Director's reports at board meetings, too much of his time is focussed on ancillary non-essentials—reporting on legislative updates, art therapy for East Bay firestorm victims, the Cultural Affairs Task Force—while the core of what the Center for the Arts will be does not get addressed. Just one example, as far back as its July 1991 meeting, the board requested a written mission statement and case statement developed by in-house staff, but it has yet to be produced.

Furthermore, to reiterate the point made in the introduction, the Executive Director needs to be the central creative vision of the organization, sufficient to implement the organization's product even in the absence of Program Directors. It is only with the product vision that appropriate management processes and priorities can be established, and various organizational spheres mediated. This lack of product vision has hampered the current staffing design and implementation.

Future Staffing Structure

Starting with the organization from where it is now, and turning that around, is an immensely difficult task. It is hard to comment on the future staff structure, because those needs in part derive from the current staffing. Since the management team has concerns about the capacity of some of the current staff to competently execute their jobs, it confuses the issue of which additional positions need to be added at what time, and at what compensation level. If the Personnel Committee of the board wishes to discuss this in greater detail with members of the management team, it can be arranged.

A few general comments follow. Staff should be hired to do work that needs to be done, not to create work that fits a certain job description. For example, the organization needs a writer. This writer could conceivably write press releases, brochure copy and grant requests. There is not enough activity in any one of

these areas to warrant a separate person for Public Relations Assistant and Grantwriter. In general, the staffing structure is being too rigidly and bureaucratically designed, which creates an unwillingness to work outside one's job description and undercuts team building. The staff needs to be designed as a team capable of working across functions.

In some cases the job descriptions and titles do not reflect what people are doing and are at variance with the organizational chart. For example, on the chart the Business Manager/Comptroller reports to the Director of Administration and in the job description the position reports to the Executive Director. Given that this position has now become vacant, it should be rethought. If the Administrative Director is going to be the Chief Financial Officer then perhaps the Business Manager position should actually be that of a Bookkeeper. It was also unclear what the Executive Assistant position does and why it is more highly paid than the Business Manager/Comptroller.

In another example, the Development Assistant was also called the Research Associate and is now being replaced by a Director of Institutional Gifts. Since the organization has yet to receive an institutional gift, it seems like what is really called for here is a Development Assistant.

Despite his considerable competence, the Operations Director is in danger of becoming overburdened. (This is our observation, not his.) According to the organizational chart, the majority of the staff will ultimately report to him. Currently, he is also functioning as the in-house computer consultant, supervising the data processor, and consulting on the box office and software needs. He has also been charged with negotiating the labor contract, and figuring out the bookstore, restaurant and cafe concessions. This is too much and could take his focus away from the primary objective—to get the building operational. The Executive Director needs to be more directly involved in these issues.

There seems to be little emphasis in the organizational staffing chart on the programming area or the staff needed to implement the kinds of programming envisioned. This no doubt was due to the absence of program directors, but it will create a potential problem since, for the most part, the current staff has little to no experience in the arts, let alone a multicultural organization or a performing arts center.

Positions responsible for income generation—specifically marketing and development—should have that activity as the central focus of their jobs. It is telling that there is no Marketing Director, but that function is placed under the Director of Communications.

Salary Scales

Non-profit arts organizations are consistently underpaid for the services they provide and, the more alternative, grass-roots and multicultural the organization, the more likely the personnel is seriously underpaid. Museum curators, university faculty, art historians and arts administrators are modestly paid as well, relative to the business community's standards of compensation. The salary scales of Center for the Arts staff position them well-above the aforementioned positions and raise serious questions about the design and efficiency of the administrative hierarchy, particularly one currently 100% supported by the city's tax base.

Underpaying workers in the arts field is not a situation that we in any way wish to perpetuate. Quite the contrary. What we are cautioning here is a matter of degree. Compensation should be set in the context of the organization, its mission, its external environment, and the market rate to obtain the needed skills to get the job done. More could be accomplished with less. To continue to hire under the existing system will create a personnel-hungry monster that will limit the Center's ability to ratchet down appropriately as needed.

The consensus of the management team is that staff salaries are high (embarrassingly high according to several consultants) in comparison with like organizations in the field, and particularly in comparison to the constituent organizations the Center is designed to serve. For every job listing, the Center has been inundated with applicants. It is not necessary to double a candidate's current salary in order to hire them, as has happened with hiring for the Center.

The comparative salary survey conducted by the Management Center to address this issue was judged by this team to be inappropriate and self-serving and did not demonstrate an understanding of the arts field. The desire of the less-than \$1 million-budget Center to compare itself, not with its peer presenters or with its target constituency, but with the city's major \$30 million-budget organizations calls into question its commitment to its mission.

These high salaries, in conjunction with very generous benefits (23% of salaries), serve to further fuel the ill will in the local community, particularly in this climate of economic recession. While some organizations are going out of business, and others are continuing to work without pay, it is painful for the arts community to see the Center staff paid at above-market rates.

Part of the community dialogue around multiculturalism in the arts has been framed in terms of the "haves" and the "have nots." Ironically, the organization charged with serving that "have not" constituency is eating up its potential rental

subsidy with a bloated and overpaid staff. Additionally, budgeting merit increases for staff that, on the whole, are overpaid, and whose job performance is still in question was problematic for many of the reviewing consultants.

Staff Composition

It is of primary importance that the staff reflect the Center's mission both in symbol and practice. If multiculturalism is the mission, it is inconsistent that individuals other than qualified people of color would be sought for the Center's leadership and advisement. If the majority of the programming is to reflect cultural diversity, then the majority of both the board and staff leadership should be comprised of qualified people of color. Currently, the Executive Director is a white male; the management staff of six contains two individuals (33%) of color. The support staff is 100% people of color. A more believable reflection of a commitment to the stated mission would be to reverse these ratios.

Financial Tracking

When management team members met with the Business Manager (who has since resigned) one of the subjects reviewed was the management letters issued to CFA by Deloitte-Touche, CFA's independent auditors for 1990 and 1991. While most of the issues raised in those letters had been addressed and corrected by the Center, it was surprising to note that the item that had appeared in the letters for both years—the lack of an adequate, computerized accounting system—had still not been addressed.

At the time of our interview there was a lack of comprehensive overview exhibited in determining the Center's tracking systems, and little thought given to how the financial functions will integrate with the box office functions (something that will be made much more difficult by the noncompatible computer systems under consideration).

Management Effectiveness

The CEO's "bunker mentality" has extended to the way in which staff is managed as well, with the result that staff morale is low, oversight is inadequate, and there is a serious lack of team work approach to the issues facing the Center. Given this hands-off, laissez-faire management style, in conjunction with the frequent physical absence of the Executive Director, numerous and counterproductive "turf battles" have developed. Because some of the managers have inadequate skills in managing, an unhealthy "us and them" divisiveness has emerged. This is unusual in so small an organization, and if uncorrected could create greater problems down the road.

Effective communication with the staff, with the board, and with community is the *sine qua non* to having this project become a success, and it does not appear to be happening. The executive director reports that he is "paralyzed in his relationship with the board president," the staff complains that the Executive Director ducks the hard issues and won't back them up in executing their jobs, and the community feels in the dark and increasingly angry about the entire project.

Recommendations

Planning

Develop a plan. Make it realistic. Do it immediately.

Staffing

We strongly recommend CFA evaluate the current staff's effectiveness, promptly make appropriate changes, and reconfigure the staffing structure before any additional staff are hired. The primary focus in this reconfiguration should be on getting tasks accomplished, as opposed to building separate departments.

Given the Executive Director's schedule, a "number-two" position should be designated as the Deputy Director in his absence. Logically, this position should be the Director of Administration.

To ease the burden on the Operations Director, one recommendation would be to reduce the full-time technical support staff, but augment them with part-time people on an as-needed basis. Another would be to treat the bookstore as a part of the artistic, educational program and assign its operation to the Program Directors. Since the box office staff will be working closely with the finance end of the organization, one possibility would be to have them report to the Director of Administration, another very competent staffer who is currently under-utilized.

Financial Tracking

Staff is needed who are adequately trained and qualified to undertake the bookkeeping functions of an organization such as CFA. The Director of Administration has a strong understanding of budgeting and tracking, but needs to be supported by someone who has the technical skills (full charge bookkeeping and computer knowledge) necessary for tracking the finances of an organization.

We would also recommend that a comprehensive approach be taken to computerization within the organization. Significant amounts of money have already been spent on computer equipment. Before further funds are disbursed, we recommend staff, together with an outside consultant if necessary, create a plan for an integrated system that will encompass all the organization's activities—current and anticipated. This will help avoid the costly mistakes that will have to be corrected later if a piecemeal approach is taken now.

Budget Projections

Without a program or products to sell, any examination of operating budgets is difficult, because the numbers derive from hypothetical models which are based on "comparables." Nonetheless, the management team was unanimous in their evaluation that both the income and expense projections are highly inflated, based on "plugged" numbers, and do not reflect a reasonably probable reality. The lack of any solid rationale for most of the budget numbers presented only helped to reinforce this evaluation.

Before reliable figures can be determined, the organization must negotiate with the labor union costs, and begin to sketch out a program plan that includes probable booking fees. However, more can be done now in terms of providing backup for budget assumptions and sketching out reasonable projected costs.

It is critical that CFA construct budgets that are grounded in reality, not only for the sake of having a budget that is a true management tool, but also because of the nature of CFA's funding from the Redevelopment Agency. Section 12.07 (a) of the Operating Agreement states that "the Agency shall have no obligation to fund the Budget of the Operator unless. . . the Agency's Budget with respect to the Cultural Facilities has been funded by the City. . ." This would seem to indicate that CFA's funding from the Redevelopment Agency is intertwined with the process of City budgeting, which is a highly politicized process. Thus, CFA's budget is vulnerable to political attack (as last year's City budget process proved), and as such, is under additional pressure to be based in reality and to be supported by thorough, logical, documented assumptions.

The Process

A thorough budgeting process is a prerequisite to developing a realistic, and therefore useful, budget. While CFA appears to have an adequate budget review process procedurally, the management team expressed concern at the obvious lack of scrutiny given to the actual numbers at each stage of the process.

Reportedly, each department is responsible for putting together its preliminary department budget. The Business Manager noted that some departments had difficulty with this, and that he more or less did their budgeting for them. Each department should have on-line responsibility for the monies earned and spent by its department. However, it is usually more

difficult to get staff to take that kind of responsibility if they have not played a role in setting the initial budget parameters.

After a preliminary budget is created, it is reviewed by the Executive Director. The Director has the responsibility to thoroughly examine the numbers and to ensure that adequate documentation is available to support the numbers presented. The lack of support documentation for the budgets would seem to indicate that this thorough examination has not been done.

The Finance Committee then reviews the budget before it is presented to the Board. CFA's Co-Treasurers seem to have done their job in raising questions about the feasibility of the income projections, and interviews with staff indicated that other members of the Finance Committee also had reservations about the reasonableness of the budget projections. Given these concerns, it is somewhat surprising that the budgets were allowed to be submitted to the Agency as they were.

The Budget

We were given an "original" three-year budget, as well as two other "scenarios" that assumed lower contributed income amounts (75% of goal and 50% of goal) than originally projected. Without specific, supporting footnotes, however, it appears there are a lot of padding and duplicate costs in all of these budgets.

Further, it is not clear if the different "scenarios" represent realistic cost cuts—the cuts appear to have been made somewhat arbitrarily. For example, if the development goal is lower, it would seem logical that the development department should take a staff cut along with the other departments, but this is not the case. Also, in making staff cuts, it would be more economically feasible (and possibly more efficient) to make them in middle level management, not administrative assistance. Overall, these revised budgets only reinforce the impression that CFA does not have an adequate understanding of budgeting or financial analysis.

What follows is a section by section analysis of the budgets presented to the management team by Center for the Arts. A copy of the original budget is included at Appendix I for reference.

Earned Revenue Projections

All revenue figures should be footnoted, with explanations of the underlying assumptions.

The performance spaces are projected to be income-generating more than 80% of the available time. This is not realistic as it does not allow adequate time for load-in, load-out and tech time. Further, it is unrealistic to assume only four to six performances for a theater production as the set-up costs would not be economically feasible without at least a three week run.

Similarly, the percentage capacity sold for admissions is quite high and does not reflect the current Bay Area arts attendance environment (see the Marketing section of this report for further discussion of this issue).

The model for revenue projections is too complicated and cumbersome to use as a tool for analysis. Since it is based on conjecture, it would make more sense to use a model that is based on averages (such as the examples provided at Appendix G). A simplified model is more useful for analysis and for gauging impact on income when one or more of the variables is altered. It is the management team's understanding that CFA's Director of Administration has already taken our sample and adapted it for the organization's use.

Footnotes are needed to indicate the basis for the rental fees, and what services those fees will include, if any. They seem high for the local market if the rental fee covers only the physical space.

Contributed Income Projections

A supporting chart/footnote is needed to indicate the source and amount of contributed income, i.e., individuals, foundations, corporations. When asked for this backup information, CFA's Development Director was unwilling or unable to provide support documentation for either the corporate or foundation income projections.

A footnote is needed to explain how the SFRA funding and reserves are calculated.

If "Other Income" means "Interest," we suggest it be called that.

Expenses—Salaries/Benefits

Salaries are a significant portion of the budget. It is not clear what is included in the very generous 23% benefits. This percentage is significantly above the local average. Similarly, the "merit increases for returning staff" is a misleading term. We would recommend renaming this item to

reflect the fact that it is really cost-of-living and merit increases—maybe, "Pool for Salary Increases."

Expenses—Contract Services

What function is the fundraising counsel filling that a development staff of five cannot? The money being expended on this function brings into question the efficiency of the development staff.

Again, a footnote is needed to indicate what is included in the line item "Management Consultants."

Expenses—Programming

Programming support documentation worksheets should all be in the same format and should more obviously tie into the total budget number. A footnote referencing these worksheets would be helpful. Again, the program expense worksheets, like the revenue projections, are unduly complicated and cumbersome for purposes of analysis or judging the impact of a change in variables.

Expenses—Public Relations/Marketing

Footnotes are needed to indicate what the "Public Relations" and "Marketing" line items include. It is not clear what costs these items would cover in addition to the breakout already provided under this section. The lack of supporting detail here reinforces the evaluation that these numbers are "plugged."

Expenses—Development

Footnotes are needed to explain what is included in "General fundraising expense," "Campaign expenses," and "Special events."

Expenses—Equipment

A footnote schedule is needed for each equipment line item, indicating what is included in the amounts. Similarly, it is not clear what is included in equipment maintenance. Any specific information re: service agreements, etc., should be included in a footnote.

Expenses—Rentals and Leases

Again, footnotes are needed explaining what these amounts represent.

Expenses—Miscellaneous Charges

The lack of specificity in this section is unacceptable. Supporting documentation should answer the following questions:

What memberships are included in that line item? What is included in subscriptions? What is "Miscellaneous business expense"? What is included in the travel expenses? Who will be travelling where for what purposes? What is "equipment service"? How is this different from the other equipment costs listed earlier? The bank fees seem very high. What is the basis for these figures?

An explanation is needed for such a vague term as "Program Planning Supplement." Why is it not included under program expenses?

Recommendations

Start over and develop a new budget based on realistic fundraising goals and earned income projections. Adequate support documentation should be provided as footnotes to the budget to explain the underlying assumptions. We recommend that a department budget worksheet be developed, so that all departments are formulating budgets that are identical in format and nomenclature. We also recommend changes in the budget format as indicated in the budget analysis above.

Further questions that should be answered at some point include:

- How many tickets must be sold for a performance to break even?
- What will be the average exhibit cost per square foot?
- What will be the breakeven point for the bookstore and cafe?
- What will be the average operational cost per square foot?
- What are the cost/benefit ratios for each department (i.e., fundraising, marketing, etc.)?

Summary

One approach to a management evaluation is to look at the indicators of a promising start-up arts organization and evaluate against those indicators. Key indicators include: a clearly identified, understood, and universally endorsed mission; an experienced, capable management team working in partnership with board leadership possessing the functional expertise and attributes to assure the organization's success; an identifiable market and evidence that the organization has targeted segments in that market; a clear plan of action (that includes realistic projections of box office receipts, realistic pricing, evidence that the organization can elicit the interest of funders, and a contingency plan if original projections are not met); a favorable location and facilities that are commensurate with the organization's mission and programming; and assurance that the new organization will make a good 'fit' among existing arts organizations in the community.

As this report indicates, the project is in trouble on many of these key indicators. The serious degree to which the project is off course, after such an enormous investment of time and resources, has raised the question for some of the study team: "Do the powers that be want this project to fail, so that they can later say, 'Oh yes, we tried that, but it didn't work?'"

Without a lifetime's experience of racism and classism from the underside, it is difficult for a Euro-American consciousness to appreciate the subtle nuances of a kind of colonial impulse inherent in the very conception of this organization and its purpose. Thus, the mission of multiculturalism, within this project, feels driven more by political correctness or expediency than by a commitment to the necessity that we, as a society, must embrace cultural pluralism, must correctly name the reality that we live in. Without a sincere belief in the full promise of what this organization, correctly led, is capable of, the Center will be unable to remedy the problems it currently faces.

Before any decisions are made about how to proceed from here, the Agency, Board, and staff leadership need to accept and acknowledge that the project is off course. If there is consensus about the severity of the problem, then a variety of options should be thoughtfully examined. Some of the obvious ones are briefly commented on below.

- **Radical Reformation.** This would involve replacing management, rethinking the board, buying time, re-evaluating the external environment, getting a real plan—in essence, a major overhaul. This is the only option that can adequately address the systemic problems that undermine the potential of fulfilling the mission. Also, only by staying focused on a multicultural mission

will CFA have the potential to fundraise successfully and to negotiate an arrangement with the union whereby the theater has a chance of economic viability. This is the course the management team unanimously supports.

• **Retrenchment.** This would entail becoming only a subsidized rental facility. Without subsidy, none of the small groups the center was initially designed for can afford to be there. It is unclear whether CFA could legally charge different rates for users based on ethnicity, thus the Center would have to subsidize all the non-profit users. While this plan might work economically for the performing spaces, it might not work so well with the visual arts and media spaces. Also, it virtually eliminates any fundraising possibility.

Additionally, this choice fulfills neither the mission of the original project nor the economic stimulation and magnet needs of the Yerba Buena development as a whole. The Center would join the Herbst, the Cowell, the Palace of Fine Arts as another facility in town. Its complexion would, no doubt, be primarily white. It would still undoubtedly be of service, particularly to the dance community, but the visual arts spaces might not be sufficiently utilized.

• **Surrender.** This option would involve closing the operation of Center for the Arts, and transferring the facilities, on completion, to existing local organization(s) who would occupy them as the primary resident tenants.

While this is always an option, it would be a setback for the cause of multiculturalism. First of all, the buildings are not designed for, and therefore not suitable for, producing companies because there is little or no collection, storage, shop or rehearsal space. More importantly, this would totally disregard years of community effort and involvement (at government's instigation) in what was to be a facility for all the community. After this enormous investment of time, energy and commitment, such unilateral action would seriously erode public confidence in local government. It would also unjustly and inappropriately reward what one interviewee termed "the arts cannibals"—those divisive forces within the arts community who see multiculturalism more as "what's-in-it-for-me-now" than as the potential for creating entirely new ways of being together.

• **Status Quo With Fine Tuning.** This is doomed to fail because there is not enough money to pull off the plan as conceptualized by current management, which has demonstrated in this review process an inadequate understanding of the tasks involved. The "bunker mentality" of current management has already created a dysfunctional organization by hindering the formation of the necessary partnerships between Board, staff and community required to guide this project

to success. This is the course the management team unanimously rejects as a viable option.

The recommendations that follow would be appropriate should either of the first two options be followed. This is a brief review, but more detail on specifics is available under the relevant topic headings.

Stop, regroup, rethink the project. Evaluate the changes in the external environment and the appropriate CFA responses to those. Board, staff and agency should jointly revisit, discuss, and reformulate the mission statement, the goals and objectives for the project, and formulate criteria by which the success of the project will be evaluated. Create a realistic critical path chart from now until opening, that includes funding needed, construction schedule, programming and booking deadlines.

If at all possible, postpone the proposed opening date to allow a more realistic timeline for the activities that need to occur between now and then. In any event, do not open the buildings until they are fully equipped and paid for, ideally by the Redevelopment Agency. It is important that the Agency deliver buildings which live up to its claim of state-of-the-art facilities. This will be their primary selling point for rental users.

Evaluate current staff and obtain necessary expertise to implement the project. Get product knowledge on the board, and set up systems of accountability. Routinely ask hard questions. Put a leadership team in place to turn the situation around quickly and decisively. The city has lost all confidence in this venture. Get started with some specific programming and build momentum with quick victories.

The issue of union contracts must be dealt with immediately and head on. A special contract should be negotiated with provisions enabling the Center to operate on a special agreement. If this facility becomes a full-fledged union house, this project has little to no chance of succeeding. The prevailing union scale will be cost prohibitive for small and emerging multicultural organizations; the commercial presenters, if there are any, would look to a house with more capacity and therefore more profit; and the Center itself, as a presenting organization, will need to price tickets extraordinarily high, therefore becoming noncompetitive in the marketplace. More importantly, the Center will not be able to fulfill its mission of nurturing culturally diverse artistic expressions.

Create a workplan, a staffing structure and a realistic budget for the next two to three years. In short, we find the projections to be very high on the income side, and fear they are too low on the expense side. We do not believe that even the

"low end" model is currently attainable. As soon as possible, this should be done with actual numbers and real event usage days, not with plugged numbers as is now the case. Recast the budget using a reasonable earned income, confirmed contributed income, and whatever is left of the income stream after subsidizing the rental cost to an affordable level. Based on those income levels, determine what kind of organization CFA can afford to be. If there is to be any contributed income in the budget, it must be absolutely reasonable, not speculative.

Restructure the fundraising effort based on reality.

Meet with the community continually. The plan developed must be released to the public. This plan, properly presented, should provide the information necessary to build confidence and commitment for the project in all sectors of the community from which support is needed. It should clearly communicate a vision for the Center, what will happen there, how it will be financed, and who is behind the project. In short, it must communicate the message that the project is conceived, backed, and will be implemented by people who know what they are doing.

Start slow and small. Do a few things very well and build a positive reputation. See what can be accomplished on the money that is known to be in hand now. The first season should focus on local groups to whatever extent possible.

Most of this report has focused on what is wrong, as is the nature of the task assigned. However, it is also important to stress the positive aspects of this project. These will be two very beautiful buildings provided by city government for use by the community. Even while in the long term the income stream may be inadequate, it is a luxury for any arts organization to begin its existence with a \$2.2 million subsidy. This combined gift by the city is a great and rare opportunity, one that comes along maybe once every 50 or 100 years in the life of a community. The Center for the Arts has been charged with inventing the arts future in San Francisco. Business as usual will not accomplish this task. Take courage.

Appendices

- A. Resumes of Consultant Team
- B. Interviewees
- C. Development of Facilities Concept for Center for the Arts
- D. Comparison of Center for the Arts with Other Arts Facilities
- E. Examples of Groups That Have Performed in a 750-800 Seat Theater
- F. Possible Contacts for Booking Opportunities
- G. Sample Revenue Models
- H. History of Growth of Campaign Goals
- I. Original Center for the Arts Budget

M. Melanie Beene

1505 Bridgeway, Suite 101 , Sausalito, California, 94965 - Tel. 415-331-0168

EXPERIENCE

1990 to present Managing Consultant for the Advancement Program
of the National Endowment for the Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Designed and implemented a \$1.2 million technical assistance delivery program that services 50 arts organizations throughout the country. Includes conference planning and production, publications and supervision of a staff of twenty.

1983 to present Consultant to the Advancement Program
of the National Endowment for the Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Comprehensive management consulting with clients throughout the country who are grantees in the Endowment's Advancement Program. Focus was on organizational development and long range planning.

1979 to present Consultant to non-profit organizations

Organizational development, long-range planning, fund-raising strategy, grant writing, systems development, marketing public relations, budget preparation and analysis, board development, financial management, incorporation, and filing for tax exemption. See enclosed client list.

In addition, have worked for government agencies and foundations doing grant reviews, management audits, on-site evaluations, training and program design (e.g., the Bay Area Multicultural Initiative).

1984 to 1988 Director, Management Assistance Program
of the National Alliance of Media Arts Organizations

1978 to 1979 Associate Director, C.A.A.C.T.
San Francisco, CA.

Overall operational responsibility for American Conservatory Theatre's fund-raising corporation.

1977 to 1978 Associate Development Director,
San Francisco Symphony

1977, Summer	Public Information Specialist Brevard Music Center, Brevard, N.C.
1976	Intern, General Counsel's Office National Endowment for the Arts
1974	Reporter, Prince George's County Post Suburban Washington, D.C.
1972 to 1973	Assistant Editor, <u>Alumnus Magazine</u> Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN

EDUCATION

1977	J.D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
1974	M.A., Asian Art History, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
1970	B.A., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
1970	East-West Center Grant for Asian Studies, University of Hawaii
1969	University of Copenhagen, Denmark (spring semester)
1968	Harvard University, Cambridge, MA (summer)

SPECIAL TRAINING

1977	Kennedy-Sinclair Course in Deferred Giving
1976	Performing Arts Management Institute, New York, NY

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1981	Faculty, Arts Administration Program University of California, San Francisco Extension
1977	Legal Process, Graduate School of Education University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
1976	Environmental Law, Graduate School of Planning, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
1974	History of Japanese Painting University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
1973	History of Modern Painting University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

WORKSHOPS

- 1973 to Present Numerous workshops in fund-raising planning and arts administration
- 1991 Panelist, Inter-Arts Program Policy Panel
National Endowment for the Arts
Washington, DC
- Speaker, "The Advancement Program"
National Council for the Arts
National Endowment for the Arts
Washington, DC
- 1990 Speaker, "Facing Change"
National Society of Fund Raising Executives Fund Raising Day
Santa Clara, California
- Panelist, Columbus Arts Festival Dialogue
"Symphony Orchestras: Dynasties or Dinosaurs?"
Columbus, Ohio
- 1989 "An Orchestra, Wanted: Dead or Alive," speech and article,
American Symphony Orchestra League Annual Conference
San Francisco, California
- 1988 Keynote Speaker, Annual Conference of the
Association of California Symphony Orchestras (ACSO)
Santa Ana, California

PUBLICATIONS

- 1988 Autopsy of an Orchestra, with F. Johnson and P. Mitchell.

AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES

- Current Affiliate artist (writer), Headlands Center for the Arts
- Current Member, State Bar of California
- Current Board member, Paul Dresher Ensemble
- Current Board of Advisors member, Institute of Non-Profit Management,
University of San Francisco
- Current Member National Advisory Committee, Asian Cine Vision
- 1984 Board member, Headlands Center for the Arts
- 1984 Board member, Legal Services for Children
- 1982-83 Volunteer Counselor, Planned Parenthood
- 1979-80 Member, Lawyer's Club of San Francisco

AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES (Continued)

1979-81	Board member, Bay Area Lawyers for the Arts
1978-79	Treasurer, San Francisco Arts Advocates
1979	Congress Committee, California Confederation of the Arts
1978	Organizing Committee, Bay Area Save the Arts Committee

M. Melanie Beene

1505 Bridgeway, Suite 101, Sausalito, California, 94965 - Tel. 415-331-0168

CLIENT LIST As of September 30, 1991

Unless otherwise indicated, groups are located in San Francisco, CA.

Academy of Media and Theatre Arts

American Inroads

American Symphony Orchestra League

Aptos Creative Arts Fund

Archives for the Performing Arts

Art of the Matter Foundation

Association of California Symphony Orchestras, Sacramento, CA

Asian American Theatre Company

Bay Area Lawyers for the Arts

Bay Area Partnership, Oakland, CA

Briarcombe Foundation

Cabrillo Music Festival, Aptos, CA

California Arts Council, Sacramento, CA

California Consortium of Expansion Arts Organizations

Cal Performances, Berkeley, CA

Calyx, Corvallis, OR

Center Arts, Arcata, CA

Center for Contemporary Arts, Santa Fe, NM

Chamber Music Northwest, Portland OR

City Celebration, Inc.

Cine Accion

Dayton Hudson Foundation, Minneapolis MN

Dimensions Dance Theatre, Oakland, CA

Eureka Theatre

Film Arts Foundation

Film Forum, Los Angeles, CA

Free Association Theatre

Galleria De La Raza

George Coates Performance Works

Golden Gate National Parks Association

Headlands Center for the Arts, Sausalito, CA

James Irvine Foundation

Jewish Film Festival, Berkeley, CA
Kidstuff, Berkeley, CA

La Corte Musicale, Berkeley, CA
Learning Education through the Arts Project (LEAP)
Libro De Buen Amor Project (Film Production), Berkeley, CA

Marin Museum of the American Indian, Novato, CA
Mary Watkins and Company
Maryville College, Maryville, TN

Mervyn's Stores, Hayward CA
The Meyer Foundation, Washington, D.C.
The Mexican Museum
Mill Valley Center for the Performing Arts, Mill Valley, CA

National Alliance of Media Arts Centers, New York, NY
National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
Nightfire Theatre

Oakland Ensemble Theatre, Oakland, CA
Oakland Youth Chorus, Oakland, CA

Paul Dresher Ensemble, Berkeley, CA
Public Arts Works, San Rafael, CA

Sacramento Opera Association, Sacramento, CA
San Domenico School, San Anselmo, CA
San Francisco Bay-Delta Preservation Association
San Francisco Camerawork
The San Francisco Foundation
The San Francisco Hotel Tax Fund, Grants for the Arts
San Francisco Moving Company
The San Francisco Symphony
Sew/Lorraine Hansberry Theatre
Soon 3 Theatre Company

A Traveling Jewish Theatre
Venice Biennale Project (Architectural Exhibit)

Walter and Elise Haas Foundation
Women Arts Journal, Knoxville, TN

YMCA, Greenville, TN
Zellerbach Family Fund
Zyzyva

Wallace I. Edgecombe
7 Fordham Hill Oval #14G
Bronx, New York 10468
(212) 933-5254

EMPLOYMENT

1982 - Present Director, Hostos Culture & Arts Program, Hostos Community College, CUNY
1979 - 1989 Director, Office of College Relations, Hostos Community College, CUNY
1973 - 1979 Assistant Director, Office of College Relations, Hostos Community College, CUNY
1971 - 1972 Desk Assistant, CBS Radio Network; temporary duty as Associate Producer of "Spectrum" on CBS Radio and TV

EDUCATION

1964 - 1966 Hobart College, Geneva, NY
1968 - 1971 Columbia University, School of General Studies, New York, NY
Degree: B.A., History; Latin American Studies Program; dean's list
1972 - 1973 Columbia University, Graduate School of Journalism, New York, NY
Degree: M.S., Journalism

PERSONAL

Born: December 31, 1945, Havana, Cuba; U.S. Citizen
Languages: Spanish (fluent reading, writing, speaking)
Interests: Performing and visual arts; Latin American and urban affairs

AFFILIATIONS

Grants panelist and site evaluator, National Endowment for the Arts (1990-91)
Grants panelist, New York State Council on the Arts (current)
Grants panelist, Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Arts Partners Program (1991)
Grants panelist, Bronx Council on the Arts (1983-89)
Board Chairman, South Bronx Community Action Theatre (1986-1991)
Board Member, Bronx Arts Ensemble (1989-present)
Board Member, Museum of Contemporary Hispanic Art (1986-89)

Description of Duties as Director of Hostos Culture & Arts Program

As Director of the Hostos Culture & Arts Program, serve as the executive officer of a multi-arts program which includes the following components:

- A music and dance concert series presenting artists of national and international renown (8-10 per year).
- A local or emerging artists presentation series showcasing performing artists of promise (mostly Bronx-based).
- A visual arts exhibitions series (three per year).
- An emerging individual artists program which consists of apprenticeships and commissions.
- A workshop series (folk arts, dance, drama, literary arts) designed for amateurs and emerging professionals.

Duties focus on six major areas of responsibility:

Programming

- Chair the Program's steering committee for programming.
- Act as liaison and principal staff member for the Program's board.
- Maintain and control proposals for activities from individual artists.
- Develop a complete calendar of activities in each of the components of the Program.
- Negotiate contracts and contract riders with artists and agencies.

Administration

- Develop an overall budget for the Program, including budgets for artists' fees, equipment rentals and purchases, administrative and technical personnel, supplies, transportation, advertising and other expenses.
- Oversee the fiscal management of the Program; supervise the maintenance of the Program's books.
- Oversee the administration of all Program grants.
- Supervise the box office operation.

Production

- Supervise upper-level production staff.
- Develop, with the production coordinator, a budget for production equipment, rentals and supplies.

Promotion

- Develop a promotional plan for each season to include publications production, advertising, press coverage and reviews.
- Insure the maintenance of an effective direct mail operation.
- Write, translate and edit many of the Program's brochures, essays and catalogs.

Development

- Responsible for the overall fundraising for the Program.
- Produce one major fundraising event per year.
- Submit all proposals to foundations and corporations.
- Write and submit proposals to government granting agencies, including the Department of Cultural Affairs, NYC; the National Endowment for the Arts; and the New York State Council on the Arts.

Achievements

As director of the Hostos Culture & Arts Program since its inception in 1982, have been accountable and responsible for its growth and development. Since then, the Program has become one of the premier multi-arts programs in the New York Latino community. It is the only multi-arts program of its kind in the Bronx. In its nine years of existence the Program has:

- Presented a total of 84 music and dance concerts by such artists as Ruben Blades, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Danny Rivera, Michel Camilo, the Dance Theatre of Harlem, Ballet Hispanico, Dizzie Gillespie, Paquito D'Rivera, Celia Cruz, Tito Puente, Pablo Elvira, Horacio Gutierrez and Eddie Palmieri.
- Presented a total of 31 art and photography exhibitions of works by such artists as Antonio Martorell, Myrna Baez, Ralph Fasanella, Jack Delano, Faith Ringgold, Raul Acero, James Van der Zee, Felix Cordero and Randy Barcelo.
- Offered workshops in dance, drama, literary arts and folk arts to over 600 participants out of which have sprung at least 4 professional actors, eight published authors, and a number of folk artists who have gone on to ply their crafts at least on a part-time basis.

The Program's staff consists of three full-time employees, six to eight part-time employees and about 10 work/study students from Hostos Community College.

The Program is one of 42 arts organizations in the United States to have been chosen to participate in the National Endowment for the Arts' Advancement Program in 1990-91.

The Program will soon find a home in a new arts center which will be one of the centerpieces of the new Hostos Community College campus. The center will include a new gallery, a 300-seat theater and a 1,000-seat concert hall.

STEPHEN GONG

402 41st Street
Oakland, CA 94609

415/642-3036 (w)
415/654-4877 (h)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

General Manager (April 1987 - Present)
Pacific Film Archive
University Art Museum
University of California, Berkeley

Associate Director (1986 - April 1987)
National Center for Film and Video Preservation at The American Film Institute
Los Angeles, CA

Acting Director/ Assistant Director (1984-1986)
National Center for Film and Video Preservation

Program Specialist (1979-1984)
Media Arts Program,
National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC

Archives Assistant/ Archival Grants Officer (1977-1979)
The American Film Institute, Washington, DC

AFFILIATIONS

Asian Cine Vision
New York, NY
National Board of Advisors

National Asian American Telecommunications Association
San Francisco, CA
Vice Chair, Board of Directors

National Moving Image Database Standards Committee
National Center for Film and Video Preservation
Los Angeles, CA

Oakland Traditional Arts Advisory Committee
Oakland, CA

Multicultural Programming Board
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, DC

STEPHEN GONG

Page two

FORMER AFFILIATIONS:

National Alliance of Media Arts Centers
President, Board of Directors (1986-1988)

Visual Communications, Los Angeles, CA
Vice-President, Board of Directors

California Arts Council Multicultural Advisory Panel
Chair, 1987-1988

LECTURES AND PROGRAMMING (Selected):

A Place to Stand: Images from Another America (August 1991)
University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI
a film series with program notes and symposia

Images of Asians in American Film
University of California at Berkeley and Cornell University
lecture and screening

Chinatown USA: The Chinese in American Film (July 1989)
University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI
with program notes, guest speakers and symposia

10th Hawaii International Film Festival (December 1986)
Honolulu, HI
presented several programs, including the restored version of LOST
HORIZON, early American comedies with Chinatown settings, and a
seminar on preserving Hawaii's moving image heritage.

Japanese American National Museum (September 1986)
Los Angeles, CA
a special presentation of THE DRAGON PAINTER, a silent film with live music
accompaniment and benshi-style translation of foreign titles. (Also presented in
New York and Berkeley in 1982.

"To Capture Their Souls on Film": A Investigation of Image Appropriation.
Western Museums Conference panel, San Jose, CA, October 1990

STEPHEN GONG

Page three

CONSULTANCIES (Selected):

Arts Planning Consultant (1985-91)

The Mexican Museum, San Francisco, CA

National Asian American Telecommunications Association, SF, CA

Make*A*Circus, SF, CA

East-West Players, Los Angeles, CA

Media Consultant (1977, 1988)

Museum of Photographic Arts, San Diego, CA

Educational Media Center, Springfield, VA

For "PEARLS", a six half-hour television series on Asian American history and issues, originally aired in 1978.

Archive Consultant (1986-87)

Hawaii Public Television Archive Project, Honolulu, HI

Pacifica Radio Foundation

ARTICLES (Selected):

"A History of Asian American Media Arts Centers"

AmerAsia Journal

University of Washington Press, 1991

"Reviewing the Reviewers"

Cinevue, Vol. IV, No.2, July, 1989

"Saving Early Cinema"

Before Hollywood: Turn-of-the-Century Film from American Archives

A film exhibition organized by the American Federation of Arts, 1986

"The Restoration of LOST HORIZON"

Catalogs of the 1986 Hawaii International Film Festival, and the 1986 United States Film Festival.

"Persistence of Vision, The Making of Yuki Shimoda: Asian American Actor"

Cine Vue, Vol.1, No. 2, June 1986

"Zen and the Art of Motion Picture Making".

Bridge magazine, Vol. 8, No.2, Winter 1982.

On the life and career of Sessue Hayakawa.

STEPHEN GONG

Page four

ADVISORY PANELS (selected):

Rockefeller Foundation

Media Arts Distribution Task Force, July-November 1989

Oakland Arts Council

Visual and Media Arts Panel, 1989

National Endowment for the Arts

AFI/NEA Film Preservation Program 1990

Southwest Regional Production Grants, 1988

Media Arts Centers Panel 1987

California Arts Council

Challenge Grants Panel, 1989-90

Media Arts Panel, 1986-87

Organization Grants Panel, 1988

EDUCATION

San Bernardino High School (1970)

Graduation with Highest Honors

University of California, Berkeley (1970-1972)

College of Environmental Design

School of Architecture

University of California, Berkeley (1973-1975)

Department of English

Bachelor of Arts (1975)

University of Southern California (1975-1977)

Department of Cinema

ABT, MA in History and Criticism

REFERENCES

James Yee, National Asian American Telecommunications Association, SF, CA

Jennifer Dowley, Headlands Center for the Arts, Sausalito, CA

Dee Davis, Appalshop, Inc., Whitesburg, KY

Other references available on request

JULIANA GRENZEBACK
3143 Harrison Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
(415) 826-1611

EXPERIENCE:

Program Manager, Melanie Beene and Associates, Sausalito, CA.

Responsible for all administration aspects of \$1.2 million Cooperative Agreement with NEA Advancement Program. Maintain all accounting and tracking systems; develop and produce conferences; research, write and edit publications, including Arts Manager's Financial Management Toolbox. Provide financial management consulting for groups participating in NEA Advancement Program. Read and critique organizational long range plans produced by groups participating in program.

May, 1990 - Present

Consultant, Various clients. See attached list.

Provide consulting services in financial management, fundraising and organizational development to non-profit groups.

July, 1987 - Present

Development Director, City Celebration, Inc, San Francisco.

Responsible for fundraising activities of multicultural non-profit arts organization with budget of \$700,000, 85% from contributed income. Researched, developed and prepared grant proposals. Wrote and coordinated direct mail appeals. Produced fundraising events. Acted as liaison for all Board of Directors' fundraising activities. With Business Manager, developed annual budgets for organization. Coordinated staff planning meetings and wrote organization's three year plan, including financial projections. Wrote and produced semi-annual newsletter and new organizational brochure. Served as Acting Executive Director after resignation of Executive Director.

October, 1988 - May, 1990

Production Manager, Teatro de la Esperanza, San Francisco.

Managed all aspects of producing national touring show, "Teo's Final Spin". Developed master schedule for production; hired personnel; supervised designers and production crew. Acted as liaison with Mission Cultural Center for two preview performances. Supervised budgeting, including financial reporting to company.

February, 1988 - April, 1988

Administrator, Young Audiences of the Bay Area, San Francisco.

Business manager for non-profit arts organization with budget of \$250,000. Responsible for budgeting; full charge bookkeeping; compiling and analyzing statistical data. Developed and wrote grant proposals and direct mail appeals. Designed and wrote copy for fundraising materials. Scheduled programs and acted as liaison between artists and schools. Planned and executed annual events. Participated in long-range planning for organization. Selected and implemented small computer system for all organizational functions.

October, 1984 - July, 1987

Producing Director, Bay Area Theatresports, San Francisco.

Co-founder and executive officer of improvisational theatre "league". Responsible for all aspects of organization, including workshops, performances, publicity, audience development and financial management.

September, 1986 - July, 1987

Stage Manager, Various productions. Production resume available on request.

January, 1986 - June, 1989

Wardrobe Supervisor, Various productions. Production resume available on request.

June, 1983 - September, 1987

PUBLICATIONS:

Fear and Loathing in Financial Management: Overcoming Analysis Aversion in Small Non-profit Arts Organizations. Thesis for M.B.A., 1991.

Arts Manager's Financial Management Toolbox. For the National Endowment for the Arts Advancement Program, 1991.

EDUCATION:

M.B.A., Arts Administration. Golden Gate University, San Francisco. April 1991. Outstanding Student Award.

B.S., Business Administration, emphases in Finance, International Business. University of San Francisco. May 1982. Magna cum laude.

Diploma, Intensive Spanish Language Course, Intermediate and Advanced levels. Colegio de Espana, Salamanca, Spain. March 1983.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Languages: Spanish. Some French.

Treasurer of the Board of Directors, Theatre Flamenco, 1988-89

REFERENCES: Available on request.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS 3/89 to present

Field Consultant for the Advancement Program

Presently working with four mid-size arts organizations, providing needs assessment and technical assistance as required for one year.

Organizations are: Chanticleer, Bay Area Women's Philharmonic, Dell'Arte Players and Institute of Alaska Native Artists.

CONSULTANT TO NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS 6/88 to present

In addition, I continue to provide consulting services to a number of other non-profit organizations. (See attached Client List for details)

SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY

Director of Volunteer Activities 8/86 to 6/88

Responsible for coordination of volunteer effort on behalf of the Symphony, raising over 2.7 million dollars in FY 86-87. Supervised staff of 3, with roster of 1,500 volunteers. Activities included gala benefits, the Black and White Ball, a thrift store, retail wine program and gift sales, a travel program and similar fundraising projects

Membership/Special Gifts Manager 8/85 to 8/86

Responsible for raising over \$500,000 in FY 85/86 in corporate and individual gifts by means of direct mail, telemarketing and coordination of volunteer solicitation effort.

CABRILLO MUSIC FESTIVAL

Executive Director 3/82 to 8/85

Full responsibility for administration and production of annual contemporary music festival, with year-round staff of 3 and seasonal staff of 16.

Publicist and Staff Assistant 7/81 to 3/82

Responsible for marketing of tickets, promotion and public relations. Assisted in all other aspects of administration as needed.

ADVERTISING 1964 to 1981

Worked for major New York advertising agencies as staff Copywriter, Copy Supervisor and Associate Creative Director and as free lance Marketing

(continued)

Consultant throughout this period. Clients included:

Clairol	Monsanto
Chanel	Nabisco
Revlon	Oneida Silver
General Foods	Pantene
Frito-Lay Company	Playtex International
IBM	Simmons Mattresses
Menley-James Labs	Time Magazine
Wamsutta	

Also designed and taught courses in communication skills, marketing, copywriting and general media studies at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. Advertising awards include:

CLIO for Best Cosmetic Commercial, 1966, for Clairol
Cosmetics, "Blondes"
ANNY Award of Merit, 1972, Milk-Bone Dog Biscuits,
Trade Ad Division
Copy Club Honorable Mention, 1981, Crouch & Fitzgerald,
Retail Ad Division

WORKSHOPS

In 1985, gave series of technical assistance workshops through the Cultural Council of Santa Cruz County on special event fundraising, and publicity and promotion

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

Hospice/Caring Project of Santa Cruz County (5 years)
Cultural Council of Santa Cruz County (2 years)

EDUCATION

B.A. in English from University of California at Berkeley, 1962.

Laurie MacDougall
CLIENT LIST

American Indian Contemporary Art (Long range planning)
Aunt Lute Books (Fundraising)
BOA Editions Ltd. (Organizational assessment)
Cabrillo Music Festival (Organizational assessment)
Cal Performances, University of California at Berkeley (Long range planning)
Calyx Books and Journal (Long range planning)
Cancer Support Community (Fundraising)
Chamber Music Hawaii (Long range planning)
Chanticleer (Long range planning)
City Celebrations (Marketing)
Colorado Dance Festival (Marketing)
Council for Literary Presses and Magazines (Organizational planning)
Dalkey Archive Press (Organizational assessment)
Dance Bay Area (Long range planning)
Dance Brigade (Long range planning)
Dell'Arte Players and Dell'Arte School of Physical Theater (Long range planning)
Eugene Symphony (Long range planning)
Feminist Press (Organizational assessment)
Fleishhacker Foundation (Audience Development Initiative--Marketing)
Friends of Photography (Long range planning)
George Coates Performance Works (Marketing)
Group Home Society (Fundraising)
Institute of Alaska Native Artists (Long range planning)
Interstate Cultural Center (Marketing)
Keith Terry a.k.a. Crosspulse (Writing)
Kitka (Organizational assessment)
Concepts Cultural Center (Marketing)
Kulintang Arts (Marketing)
National Endowment for the Arts Advancement Program
National Institute for Art and Disabilities (Marketing)
Melanie Beene and Associates (Long range planning, marketing, special assignments)
Mexican Museum (Marketing)
New Mexico Repertory Theater (Long range planning)
ODC/San Francisco (Marketing)
Oakland Ensemble Theater (Marketing)
Oakland Youth Chorus (Organizational and personnel assessment, fundraising and marketing)
Paul Dresher Ensemble (Fundraising)
Ploughshares Literary Magazine (Organizational assessment)
Public Art Works (Marketing)
Sacramento Opera Association (Fundraising)
Salt Lake Acting Company (Long range planning)
San Francisco Camerawork (Fundraising)
San Francisco Food Bank (Fundraising)
San Francisco Performances (Fundraising, volunteer and personnel development)
San Jose Taiko (Long range planning)
S. H. Cowell Foundation (Writing)
Tandy Beal & Company (Long range planning)
Theater Artaud (Long range planning)
Women's Philharmonic (Long range planning, marketing)

Joan Madison COLLABORATIVE

A consulting firm specializing in successful
arts programming, development and management of
facilities, corporate sponsorship, and technical assistance.

CONSULTING SERVICES

- Artist programming/booking
- Building your audience
- The art of contract negotiations
- Sensible facility management
- Feasibility studies for new and existing facilities
- Marketing . . . effective advertising, promotion analysis
- Production: dance, music, opera
- Profitable facility renovation and restoration
- Year-round resort programming
- Special event planning/production
- Staff development/training

The Joan Madison Collaborative offers consulting services usually in the form of feasibility studies for new and renovated spaces; as well as the development of operating pro forma, marketing strategy, artistic programming and the overall operating plan for performing arts facilities.

Identifying the needs of the client is often the most difficult task for the architect on a performing arts facility project — whether it be a new building or one to be renovated. The Joan Madison Collaborative has experience working with city municipalities, educational institutions, and not-for-profit organizations in defining (with them) program requirements, facility usage, space utilization and economic analysis.

The Joan Madison Collaborative can provide its clients with a diverse range of contractual services from the initial discussions and focus sessions through the conceptual development and construction phase to the actual operation of the facility. If your organization could benefit from any of these specific areas, the professional expertise required is available.

Joan Madison

COLLABORATIVE

This diverse client list represents a cross-section of cultural and arts organizations, educational institutions, foundations, and financial and retail institutions.

ARMAND HAMMER CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS, HOLYOKE, MASSACHUSETTS - Developed the overall management concept, market analysis and programming mix for the 5 million dollar renovation of a 1920's Vaudeville/movie palace into a state-of-the-art American Musical Comedy facility. The scope of this project also included three floors of commercial and retail space adjacent to the downtown theatre. This project required a direct working relationship with the architectural firm of D.P. Coffey and Associates, L.T.D.; the acoustical firm of ACENTECH; and the technical consulting firm of Systems Design Associates.

BOETTCHER CONCERT HALL - Opened and managed the new 13 million dollar Boettcher Concert Hall for The Denver Center for the Performing Arts. Developed the general operating plan; budget; rental structure; lease agreements and contract services, including the negotiation of all union contracts.

The opening of the facility included a direct working relationship with general contractors, the architectural firm of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, and the acoustical firm, Jaffee Acoustics, Inc.

BEAVER CREEK THEATRE PROJECT (Vail Associates, Inc.) - Developed the economic and programming feasibility plan for a year-round, multi-use facility in this resort community utilizing the corporate entity, Vail Associates, Inc., the Eagle-Vail community; and national touring companies.

This project required a direct working relationship with the architectural firm of Arley Rinehart & Associates; Vail Associates, Inc.; acoustical firm of R. Lawrence Kirkegaard & Associates; and S. Leonard Auerbach & Associates, technical consultants.

THE BANFF CENTRE, ALBERTA, CANADA - Developed a marketing plan to increase audience development for the winter season and the annual summer festival. Reviewed and recommended changes in their present programming for the tourist audiences, the performing arts school students, staff, and faculty; and the local Banff community.

CENTRAL CITY OPERA - Festival Administrator for this 12-week summer season union opera company. Responsible for the smooth and efficient operation of all the festival activities--three operas in rotating repertory; salon recitals; opera memos; and a two-week tour (4 seasons). Worked with the artistic director in setting the production schedule; supervised festival and production staff; general fiscal management; budget preparations; long-range planning; negotiation of all union contracts; and facility management. Oversaw the pre-season activities including staffing, housing, and transportation for the company.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE - Development of a feasibility study for Webster Hall, an early 1900's building on the Dartmouth College campus. The scope of the project included the potential of increased usage after renovation by the community members, alumni, students and faculty.

CITY OF FT. COLLINS, FT. COLLINS, COLORADO - Conducted a cultural feasibility study for this city of 93,000 people to determine the current and future needs of the performing and visual arts. In addition, an evaluation of the needs of the local conference industry was studied. The scope of this project included addressing the issue of expansion for the current Lincoln Center, the rehabing of a historic downtown hotel for use as a theatre and creating a new 3,500 seat amphitheater. This project required a direct working relationship with the architectural firms of Glasier Associates and ARIX; the landscape architectural firm of Winston Associates; and the theatrical and acoustical firm of David L. Adams Associates.

MACKY AUDITORIUM RENOVATION - Development of a user feasibility study which included the University of Colorado users; the Boulder community; and private sector use. This project required a direct working relationship with the architectural firm of Midyette/Seieroe & Associates p.c.; the acoustical firm of R. Lawrence Kirkegaard & Associates; and the technical consulting firm of S. Leonard Auerbach & Associates.

MAGNET SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS/VIRGINIA OPERA - Developed a user feasibility study for the 9 million dollar renovation of the Norfolk Center Theatre and Arena Complex through an N.E.A. Design Demonstration Grant. This was a unique opportunity to explore shared space, financial considerations, and programming needs for a professional opera company and a regional school for the arts. This project required a direct working relationship with the architectural firm of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE - Development of a user feasibility study, operating pro forma and marketing analysis for a 6.8 million dollar performing arts facility which includes a conference center and museum.

MAYAN THEATER, DENVER, COLORADO - Developed a user feasibility study for the Friends of the Mayan Theater and Landon Investments for this historic Mayan revival style theater. The feasibility and restoration plan was intended to enhance the building but also to provide the maximum potential for programming in a downtown urban area.

PARAMOUNT THEATRE, DENVER, COLORADO - Developed the overall management concept, programming mix, and marketing strategy for the renovation and restoration of a downtown art deco movie house into a state-of-the-art entertainment palace. The scope of this project included the development of a renovation plan for the theatre and the Paramount Building which has in it retail space and a restaurant/club.

THE TELLURIDE THEATRE PROJECT - Developed and researched the economic feasibility of a theatre in the resort town of Telluride, Colorado, for the architectural firm of Decker & Associates. The acoustical firm on the project was David L. Adams Associates.

UNITED BANK OF DENVER - The Joan Madison Collaborative reviewed and evaluated corporate sponsorship opportunities for community supported programs within the United Bank system. The scope of this project included recommendations for future support and the development of a plan to further increase the corporate image in the marketplace.

THE VAIL INSTITUTE FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS - Developed the general operating plan; programming concept; marketing and publicity strategy; and technical production for this eight-week summer festival (7 seasons).

VIRGINIA OPERA - Developed a management operation plan for the Virginia Opera which included Board and staff relationships, marketing, long-range planning, development and budget review analysis, and recommendations for both the Norfolk and Richmond, Virginia, operations. Reviewed, recommended, and implemented a new image and graphic concept for the Virginia Opera.

WESTERN STATES ARTS FOUNDATION - Designed and produced the 1979 Western States Management Seminar and Booking Conference. Developed a series of marketing, production on tour, artist, union, and facility contracting seminars for sponsors and presentors. In addition, provided technical assistance consulting throughout the West.

1989 WORLD ALPINE SKI CHAMPIONSHIPS - Produced opening ceremonies for this prestigious international event held in Vail Colorado, January of 1989. This night time event required the creation of a total outdoor theatre, complete with a full compliment of lights and sound. The performing and audience areas were formed from 4 tennis courts located in the center of the village. The pageantry for "A Night of Dreams" included the Colorado Childrens' Chorale, 600 athletes from over 25 locations, a rhythmic gymnastic demonstration, a torch light ski down and a lazer, light and fireworks show all set to music. The host agency for this event was the VAIL Valley Foundation.

Resume

Regina Mouton

1155 - 5th Street #304
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 836-3812

Education

- 1984-87: B.F.A. Painting, San Francisco Art Institute, CA.;
1985-86: Art Students League, New York, NY;
1972-73: University of Washington, Seattle, WA;
1965-67: M.H. de Young Museum Art School, San Francisco, CA.

Selected Awards

Bronze Roller (Excellence in Printmaking), San Francisco Art Institute, Spring 1987
California Grant A, San Francisco Art Institute, Fall 1984-Spring 1987;
Ann Davis Galantier/Board of Control Scholarship, Art Students League, New York,
NY, Fall 1985-Summer 1986;
Phelan Scholarship, San Francisco Art Institute, Fall 1984.

Selected Exhibits

- December 1991: "Umoja: Principles of Kwanza," Bayview Opera House, San Francisco;
Dec/Jan 1991: "Chain Reaction VI," San Francisco Art Commission Gallery;
Feb/Mar 1990: "Annual Exhibition 1990," Lillian Paley Center for the Visual Arts,
Oakland;
February 1990: "Daughters of Yam," performance by poets D. Major / O. Adisa-
Palmer, musician L. Jourdan, Exploratorium, San Francisco;
October 1989: "National Poetry Association," Fort Mason Gallery, San Francisco;
Jul/Aug 1989: "Sensations and Revelations," (two-person exhibition), Concepts
Cultural Gallery, Oakland;
February 1989: "Kuumba," Associated Student Union, San Francisco State University;
February 1989: "Ninth Annual Exhibition," Atlanta Life Insurance Company, Ltd
Atlanta, GA;
February 1988: "Eighth Annual Exhibition," Atlanta Life Insurance Company, Ltd.,
Atlanta;
May 1987: "Spring Exhibition," Diego Rivera Gallery, San Francisco Art Institute;
June 1986: "Paperworks," Searles/Spicer Studios, New York, NY;
May 1986: "Prints from the Source," Americana Cafe, New York;
April 1986: "Small Works," 22 Wooster Gallery, New York;
March 1985: "Art Against Apartheid," Sargent Johnson Gallery, Western Addition
Cultural Center, San Francisco;
May 1983: "Freeze Frame: Room for Living Room," performance by Suzanne Lacy,
Galeria Showroom, San Francisco;
April 1982: "Works in Progress," Travelling Mural Exhibition, Galeria de la Raza, San
Francisco.

Selected Experience

Gallery Director: 4/91-present;

Richmond Art Center, Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804;

Developing curatorial advisory committee to broaden program of exhibitions; developing community exhibitions program in auxiliary galleries through the development of an intern/volunteer committee; developing a elementary through university and community-access touring program; keep current with the work of artists through studio visits and ongoing slide review; research and select artwork; develop curatorial themes and presentations in collaboration with artists consistent with organizational goals; prepare announcements, documentation, curatorial statements; artists' biographies, signage and coordinate publicity materials; monitor program budget and assist the preparation of funding proposals and reports; oversee sales of work, catalogs, and other revenue sources; assist board presentations, fundraising events, public relations and collaborative projects with community and art agencies and institutions; oversee the conservation and maintenance of art works displayed by the center; maintain materials and develop design, installation and transportation of art; coordinate opening receptions and gallery events including outreach; prepare and negotiate contracts of lending, shipping, and insurance; and de-install exhibits and arrange for the return of art. Katheryn Reasoner, Jeff Nathanson, Executive Director, 620-6772.

Artist-In-Residence: 1-2/91;

San Francisco Unified School District, McAteer School of the Arts, 535 Portola Drive, San Francisco, CA 94131;

As project instructor of Advanced Painting Seminar, created an 100-slide review of modernism drawn largely from "Primitivism in Contemporary Art" catalogue produced by the MOMA-NY; directed junior and senior students in the creation of a 9-1/2 X 24' mural panel in the school's interior halls; created ongoing assignments in drawing and painting; assisted in exhibition of students' work in school halls and for special events.

Betty Tetske, Principal.

Consultant/Curator: 5-11/90;

"Beyond Fragments: Earthquake Commemorative Exhibition,"

City of Oakland, Public Art Program - Cultural Arts Division, 475 - 14th Street - 9th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612

Researched outreach to diversity of potential participants in professional arts community; general communities and municipalities throughout Bay Area counties; designed display/classified ad-copy and solicitation for artwork; selected visual/literary artwork for design, photography and reproduction, exhibition installation, reception and performances; prepared curatorial statements, edited catalogue text, exhibition labels and signage; organized all facets of artists' participation in exhibition, catalogue, and performance events and acted as liaison to all constituencies involved in the exhibition; worked under the guidance of the

Public Art Committee for the City of Oakland's first project of the Public Art Program.

Regina Almaguer, Public Art Coordinator, 273-2103.

Production Assistant: 9/89-4/90;

Editorial Assistant: 7/87-8/89;

Institute for Contemporary Studies, 243 Kearny Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

As production assistant, designed style-sheets for books, studies, occasional papers newsletter and book reprints to include graphs and tables, and photographs.

As editorial assistant edited and proofed public policy manuscripts for book publication working closely with rotating editors and project managers on single- and multi-authored books; corresponded with authors and assisted managing editor in all functions.

Rebecca McGovern, Managing Editor.

Artist-in-Residence: 7/88-present;

California Arts Council - East Oakland Youth Development Center, 8200 E. 14th Street, Oakland, CA 94114

Taught printmaking and painting workshops for children aged 6-21 in an after-school arts program; purchased and prepared supplies; set up exhibitions of children's work for community events; planned field trips that included cultural institutions and exhibitions.

Jimi Evins, Director, After-School Arts Program, 569-8088.

Guest Curator: 3-7/89;

"Ritual of the Sun and the Moon,"

Sargent Johnson Gallery, Western Addition Cultural Center, 761 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117

Planned and co-ordinated an exhibition of two regional artists; documented artists/artwork for gallery's quarterly newsletter, Blank Canvas; prepared text for essay and curatorial statement, labels, press releases, designed exhibition announcements and six-week installation of work.

Kemit Amenophis, Director, Sargent Johnson Gallery, 921-7976.

Curatorial Aide: 9/87-7/88;

The Oakland Museum, 1000 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94608

Provided assistance in scheduling and coordinating exhibitions; researched art department plans and programs; received artifacts and artworks; assisted in editing text in production of museum catalogues, manuscripts, books and labels; provided information and liaison to various museum organizations as well as the public; scheduled appointments, arranged meetings and provided assistance in various phases of exhibitions production for the Chief Curator, staff and guest curators Christina Orr-Cahall, Chief Curator of Art; Harvey Jones, Acting Chief Curator, Art Department, 273-3005.

Teacher's Aide: 6/65-12/67;

M. H. de Young Museum, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, CA 94117

Provided assistance to teachers and physically- and emotionally-disabled children in classroom studios; aided inventory and ordering supplies; conducted children's tours

of the art department facilities; maintained orderly studios; provided information to the public.

Elsa Cameron, Director, Art Department.

Articles/Papers

"Non-Profit Organizations in Oakland," Artscape, City of Oakland - Cultural Arts Division publication, Winter 1991;

"Culturally Inclusive Role Models: Who Are They?," Culturally Inclusive Arts Education Symposium publication, San Francisco Art Institute, September 28-29, 1991;

"Interview with Violet Fields," Society of The Americas, Meridian Gallery publication, San Francisco, Winter 1991;

"Black Artists in Britain: Parallels of the Diaspora," Society of The Americas, Winter 1991;

"Introduction - History of African-American Women Artists," Art History Survey documentation project, Dr. Moira Roth, Mills College, Oakland, Spring 1991;

"Interview with Ulysses Jenkins," Konceptualizations, Koncepts Cultural Gallery publication, Oakland, Winter 1990;

"Toward Discourse," Konceptualization, Koncepts Cultural Gallery publication, Oakland, Winter 1989.

Lectures/Panels

Guest Artist, "Culturally Inclusive Gender Models," San Francisco Art Institute, 11/91;

Lecturer, "California African-American Women Artists: Art as a Political Tool," New College of San Francisco, 11/91; invited by Juana Alicia;

Panel Moderator, "Culturally Inclusive Role Models: Who Are They?," Sources of a Distinct Majority: Part IV - Towards a Culturally Inclusive Art Education, San Francisco Art Institute, 9/91, invited by Carlos Villa, Symposium Director, Painting Instructor, S.F.A.I.;

Interviewer of artist Violet Fields, Meridian Gallery, San Francisco, 6/91; invited by Ann Brodsky, Gallery Director;

Panellist, "Expanding Multicultural American Art History," Association of Independent Colleges of Art, San Francisco Art Institute, 3/91; invited by Moira Roth, Ph.D., Trefethen Art History professor, Mills College;

Lecturer, Contemporary African American Women Artists, History Survey documentation project, Dr. Morris Roth, Mills College, Oakland, 5/1991;
Guest Artist, World College West, Petaluma, 5/88; in collaboration with performance-poet Devorah Major, invited by Juana Alicia, California Arts Council Artist-in-Residence.

Selected Professional Affiliations

Women's Slide Registry, London, England, 1991 - present;
Advisory Board Member, Othervisions, 1991- present;
Advisory Board Member, Meridian Gallery, 1991 - present;
Oakland Arts Council Grants Review Panelist, 1990 - present;
San Francisco Art Commission Slide Registry, 1989 - present;
Multicultural Task Force - Alameda Arts Commission, 1989 - 91,
San Francisco Art Policy Planning Group, Cultural Diversity Subcommittee, 1989 - 90;
Oakland WallSpeak, 1985 - 88,
Art Against Apartheid, 1984 - 85.

References [Provided upon request]

ANN SEAMSTER
542 Seaver Drive
Mill Valley, CA 94941
(415) 388-5258 h.

CAREER SUMMARY

Twenty years of broad-based Arts Management experience in nonprofit performing arts, visual arts and media production. Expertise in area of festival management, orchestra and opera management, film and television production, and events coordination. Earned a reputation for integrity, fairness, team building and effective management style.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

FESTIVAL MANAGEMENT:

- * Managed 6 week festival with 50 participating organizations and a combined production budget of \$7.2 million.
- * Managed the first successful single-theme arts festival in San Francisco.
- * Managed an extensive marketing and PR campaign.
- * Facilitated dialogue between organizations - large, small and multicultural.
- * Coordinated production of city-wide events calendar.

Mozart & His Time, A San Francisco Festival, 1991

Lotfi Mansouri, Chairman of Management Committee
1990 - 1991, Festival Manager

San Francisco Summer Festival

1982, Calendar Coordinator

ORCHESTRA MANAGEMENT:

- * Recruited and supervised staff.
- * Prepared orchestra rehearsal and performance schedules.
- * Oversaw rehearsals, performances, auditions, run-outs and tours.
- * Scheduled and implemented tour arrangements.
- * Assisted in conceptualizing a special series and contracted the artists.
- * Negotiated guest artist contracts and acted as liaison with filming crews.
- * Coordinated the operation of the hall.

San Francisco Symphony

Peter Pastreich, Executive Director (1978 to present)

Joseph A. Scafidi, Executive Director (until 1978)

1986 - 1987, Tour Associate for European Tour

1984, Acting Assistant Manager and Acting Director of Operations

1980, Assistant to Executive Director

1974 - 1976, Assistant to the Manager

OPERA MANAGEMENT:

- * Scheduled and managed tours.
- * Coordinated all rehearsal, performance and audition schedules.
- * Supervised, hired and fired staff.
- * Created systems for functioning of General Manager's office (Lyric Opera of Chicago).
- * Created and installed a photographic exhibit.
- * Coordinated major meeting of opera associations.
- * Acted as liaison between opera company and film/television company.
- * Coordinated special performance with 73 guest artists on stage at one time.

Lyric Opera of Chicago

Ardis Krainik, General Manager
1983, Assistant to the General Manager

San Francisco Opera

Kurt Herbert Adler, General Director

Live to Europe telecast of "Aida" by KCET
1981, Production Coordinator

"The Adler Years", a photographic exhibit in the War Memorial Opera House
1981, Coordinator

OPERA America and International Association of Opera Directors Joint Annual Meeting
1981, Coordinator

Summer Festival, Community Outreach Discount Program
1981, Coordinator

Live telecast of "La Gioconda" by KCET
1979, Telecast Coordinator

Filming of Emmy Award winning documentary: "Opening Night - The Making of an Opera", DeWitt Sage, Producer and Director
1979, Assistant to Producer

The Anniversary Gala, honoring Kurt Herbert Adler's Gold and Silver Jubilees
1978, Coordinator

Western Opera Theatre, the touring and educational subsidiary of San Francisco Opera
1971 - 1974, Company Coordinator

Office of the General Director, Kurt Herbert Adler
1971, Executive Secretary

FILM/TELEVISION PRODUCTION

- * Managed office and ordered equipment.
- * Prepared and analyzed budgets.
- * Negotiated prices and fees.
- * Hired, supervised crew and ensured compliance with union regulations.
- * Researched background information and locations and managed location filing.
- * Served as production coordinator and generated all schedules.
- * Acted as liaison between film/television and performing organization or artist.

Equinox Films, New York City

"Four Films on Language", a documentary series for PBS
Gene Searchinger, Producer and Director
1989, Associate Producer

KQED (San Francisco PBS Affiliate)

Live telecast of "Luciano Pavarotti Recital"
1983, Associate Producer

Short feature on San Francisco Opera's "Ring" Cycle
1983, Associate Producer

Live telecast of San Francisco Conservatory of Music's "Sing it Yourself
Messiah"
1982, Intermission Coordinator

Live telecast of San Francisco Ballet's "The Tempest", a Dance in America
program with WNET
1981, Production Coordinator

KCET (Los Angeles PBS Affiliate)

Taping of live performance of San Francisco Opera's "Samson et Dalila"
1980, Production Coordinator

Live telecast of San Francisco Symphony's Inaugural Gala, the opening of Davies
Symphony Hall
1980, Production Coordinator

Television adaptation of stage performance of "The World of My America" by
Pauline Meyers
1980, Location Scout

Live from Lincoln Center

Filming of intermission feature of Luciano Pavarotti in Modena, Italy
1979, Research and Production Assistant

EVENTS COORDINATION:

- * Drafted facilities use policy and coordinated all facility scheduling.
- * Planned museum/exhibit openings and social events.
- * Coordinated major performance honoring Isaac Stern.
- * Oversaw installation of an exhibit in a huge empty warehouse.

San Francisco Symphony

"Happy Birthday, Isaac!", honoring Isaac Stern on his 70th birthday with a
free outdoor concert.
1990, Coordinator

Minneapolis Institute of Arts

1985 - 1986, Coordinator of Scheduling and Special Events

San Francisco Arts Commission

1983, Production Coordinator for the Arts Festival

EDUCATION:

B.A. in French, University of California at Berkeley, 1969

WILLIAM E. TERRY
779 Riverside Drive
Number B-65
New York, New York 10032
(212) 781-6315

EXPERIENCE: Vice President for Educational Affairs, Detroit
Symphony Orchestra Hall, Inc., Detroit, Michigan

11/88 - Present: Manage all education and outreach programs and activities of Detroit Symphony Orchestra Hall, including Educational Concert Series, Young People's Concerts, Detroit Symphony Civic Orchestra, Docent Program, special concerts (i.e. Classical Roots), Ford Motor Company Youth Program (ticket distribution to talented music students).

Consultant, American Symphony Orchestra League, Washington, D. C.

8/87 - Present: Advise the League regarding strategies for increasing the representation of minorities in symphony orchestras. Research and identify programs the League can advocate to member orchestras.

Consultant, American Opera Theater, New York, New York.

3/87 - Present: Advise all aspects of organizational development and management, including board development, long-range planning, and fund raising. Guide the development of a strategic plan, and the solicitation of immediate fund-raising prospects (both individuals and organizations).

Cooperator, Organizational Development Pilot Program, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D. C.

10/87 - 9/90: Monitor and evaluate the progress of five dance companies selected to participate in a joint Expansion Arts Program - Dance Program initiative to assist achieve organizational development goals. Advise the companies regarding consultants in the several areas of organizational development, and serve as liaison between the companies and the National Endowment for the Arts.

WILLIAM E. TERRY

Consultant, Colorado Council on the Arts and Humanities, Denver, Colorado.

4/88 - 1/89: Designed and implemented a long-range planning process for the Council. Conducted a program of board development.

Consultant, Ohio Arts Council, Columbus, Ohio.

4/88 - 9/88: Evaluated the Minority Arts Program of the Ohio Arts Council. Conducted a review and assessment for the ten years since its creation, with particular emphasis on the evolution of the technical assistance program as a positive, creative, and appropriate means for the Council to intervene in the development of minority arts organizations.

Consultant, Detroit Symphony Orchestra, Detroit, Michigan.

3/88 - 10/88: Reviewed and evaluated the Symphony's education and outreach programs for the past ten years. Made recommendations for a redesigned program of educational services, including the creation of a training program for post-conservatory-level, minority musicians pursuing careers as instrumentalists.

Consultant, National Jazz Service Organization, Washington, D. C.

5/86 - 4/87: As chief consultant to a project designed to assess the state of jazz in Philadelphia, supervised the collection and reporting of data by the on-site consultant, analyzed data, and drafted a report of findings.

1/86 - 12/86: Managed a program of services (including accounting, legal, automated information systems, appraisals of instruments, insurances) for a jazz musician. Created a three-year development and marketing plan to guide his initiation of performing and teaching residencies in educational settings.

6/85 - 12/85: Represented the organization on the West Coast. Provided information and management assistance to jazz musicians, jazz societies, and other support organizations in the region.

WILLIAM E. TERRY

On-Site Evaluator, National Endowment for the Arts,
Washington, D. C.

1/86 - Present: Conducted site visits of more than forty performing arts organizations (music, dance, theater) across the country for the Expansion Arts Program. Provided information about artistic quality, governance and management, program planning, fund raising, and financial management for panel deliberations on applications pending for funding.

Executive Director, Maga Link, Los Angeles,
California.

10/82 - 5/85: Directed and managed all educational and public information programs of the not-for-profit corporation. Directed the Communications Bridge Program (video production training). Was responsible for financial planning and management.

Managing Director, Dance Theater of Harlem, New York, New York.

11/80 - 10/82: Managed both the professional company and the school. Negotiated contracts with unions, sponsors, choreographers, and designers. Coordinated fund-raising activities. Supervised artistic, instructional, and administrative staff. Coordinated both financial planning and management, and strategic planning.

Director, Partnership Coordination, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D. C.

7/79 - 9/80: Coordinated planning, programming, and policy development at Federal, state, regional and local levels with Endowment Programs and arts service organizations. Monitored the development and implementation of a national information system among the Endowment and state and regional arts agencies.

Assistant Director, Federal-State Partnership, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D. C.

9/77 - 7/79: Established and maintained liaison with other Endowment programs and public arts agencies. Coordinated the activities of ten Regional Representatives around the country.

WILLIAM E. TERRY

Executive Vice President, Virginia State University,
Petersburg, Virginia.

9/76 - 9/77: Had oversight responsibility for the offices of: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Resource Management; Institutional Advancement (development, information services, alumni affairs). Served as liaison between the University and state government: the General Assembly, the State Council of Higher Education, the Governor's Office and Cabinet.

Interim Executive Vice President, Virginia State University, Petersburg, Virginia.

8/75 - 9/76

Acting President, Virginia State University,
Petersburg, Virginia.

1/76 - 7/76

Assistant to the President for Development, Virginia State University, Petersburg, Virginia.

10/73 - 8/75: Directed all private-sector fund raising, conducted through the University Foundation. Managed departments of public information and alumni affairs.

Director of Development, Virginia State University,
Petersburg, Virginia.

7/72 - 10/73: Managed all phases of private-sector fund raising, including solicitation of foundations, corporations and individuals. Conducted an economic impact survey to demonstrate the level of direct and indirect spending by the University, its students, faculty, staff and visitors in the local community.

EDUCATION: Graduate Study, University of California at Berkeley,
1969
Concentration: Musicology

WILLIAM E. TERRY

B. A. Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut,
June 1966

Major: Music Theory and Composition
Graduated with High Honors

SELECTED
PROFESSIONAL
ACTIVITIES:

July 1972 to Present: Pianist, TRIO PRO VIVA (flute, cello, piano), which specializes in performing the music of black composers.

April 1989: Member, Music and Dance Panel, Expansion Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts.

September 1988: Member, Challenge Grant/Advancement Panel, Expansion Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts.

April 1988: Member, Music and Dance Panel, Expansion Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts.

June 1987: Member, Overview Panel, Expansion Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts.

April 1987: Member, Music/Dance/Combination Panel, Expansion Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts.

1982 - 83: Member, Board of Directors, British American Arts Association USA.

1982 - Member, Commission for Cultural Affairs, City of New York.

1981 - 82: Member, General Operating Support Panel, Ohio Arts Council.

1980: Member, Task Force on the Challenge Grant Program, Virginia Commission for the Arts.

1980: Conference Convener, "Black Virginians and the Virginia Commission for the Arts" (organized and supported by the Commission).

1979: Judge, First Governor's Awards for the Arts in Virginia.



EDUCATION: Harvard University, Loeb Fellow, Graduate School of Design, 1960 - 61
Texas A & M University, Artist-in-Residence, School of Environmental Design, 1972
University of Iowa, B A 1962
Baylor University, 1954 - 1959 (intermittent)

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Current projects. Consultant to Smithsonian Institution for exhibit, "Science in American Life" at National Museum of American History. Video wall project and 30 projector multi-image production for the City of Charleston Visitor Center. Consultant to the Houston Museum of Decorative Arts in Chattanooga for long-range plan. Wheelwright Museum of the American Indian in Santa Fe - consultant for long range planning and building program. Massachusetts Horticultural Society - Plantmobile Project. Consultant to Cambridge Seven Associates for Folk Art Exhibit and Museum Shop plan for Tennessee Aquarium, Chattanooga, Tennessee. Program Consultant for Weir Farm Project, Trust for Public Land.

1986-present. Self-employed as a consultant, lecturer and writer. Projects included serving as consultant to Cambridge Seven Associates and RiverCity Company for planning/programming on new Aquarium and Ross's Landing, a mixed-use project for Chattanooga, Tennessee. Consultant to Lyons and Zarembo for planning and exhibit design, new visitor's

SHERRY KAFKA WAGNER
33 RICHDALE AVENUE #226
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02140

(617) 661-5813
FAX 617-868-0319

center for Charleston, South Carolina. Consultant to Horner Associates and Thomas and Means for planning reuse of Jefferson High School, Roanoke, Virginia. Consultant for long-range planning, Wheelwright Museum of the American Indian, Santa Fe, N. M. Consultant for planning children's museum, Children's Arts and Ideas Foundation, Dallas. Consultant to Trenton Roebling Community Development Corporation for interpretative reuse of old mill site.

1983-1985. Vice-President, Arrow Associates architecture/urban design/consulting firm, San Antonio, Texas. Projects including planning and programming for the Riverton, a 20-story high-rise condominium project on the San Antonio River; planning pedestrian system for the Tri-Party (City, Downtown Owners and Transit Authority) Transportation Study; producing a planning model for downtown for the San Antonio Conservation Society; preparing a national historical landmark study of the San Antonio River Corridor for the San Antonio Conservation Society and the Department of the Interior; planning and programming the Ninth Square Redevelopment Project for New Haven, Connecticut.

1968 - 1983. Self-employed as consultant, lecturer, writer. Worked on projects in the following content areas:

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT. Planner/programmer for projects ranging from large urban redevelopment efforts to child care delivery systems to new banking facilities to marketing plan for a new urban transit system. Included among such projects are the San Antonio River Corridor Plan; the San Antonio Market

District Redevelopment Plan; the San Antonio Tri Party Transportation Plan, and the Plan for Reuse of Niles East High School in Skokie, Illinois. Plan for reuse of Trenton Roebling Mill Site, Trenton, New Jersey. With Carr/Lynch Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts, worked on the Dallas, Texas, Arts District Plan and the Phoenix, Arizona, Rio Salado Plan.

MUSEUMS. Served as consultant to more than forty museums including the Smithsonian National Museum of American History; Winterthur; Lowell, Mass. National Urban Park Booth Mill Museum, International Folk Art Museum, Santa Fe; and the Museum Services Division of the Texas Historical Commission. Projects for clients covered a broad range of services in the areas of exhibits, programs, management, museum education, facility planning/development, and long-range planning. Activities ranged from staff, board, and volunteer training to design of programs, exhibits and materials to serving as Acting Director for the purpose of restructuring, reorganizing and refinancing the museum.

FILM, TELEVISION, MEDIA. Scriptwriter for films and television including nine productions for the U S Army's Academy of Health Science; for CARRASCOLENDAS, a PBS bilingual television series for children, produced by KLRN-TV, Austin; for 3-2-1 CONTACT, a PBS children's science series produced by Children's Television Workshop, New York. Produced, directed and scripted a 20-minute film, NO LIMITS, for the San Antonio Independent School District. Produced and co-scripted film, A SPECIAL PLACE. Served as consultant to other film and television projects and as a judge for a film award series. Initiated and scripted

a 28-minute, 24-projector multi-image show, PANHANDLE PROMISE, for the Don Harrington Discovery Center in celebration of the Centennial of Amarillo, Texas. This show received the gold medal for documentary awarded by the Association for Multi-Image with a Special Merit Award for the script.

EDUCATION. Consulted on numerous education projects for schools, school districts, regional and state educational organizations and other educational groups. These projects covered such areas as teacher training, language development, classroom management, curriculum development and facilities planning. Clients have included the Texas Education Agency and a number of Regional Education Service Centers, the Association for the Education of Young Children, Frontiers for Science in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. School Districts served range from small rural districts such as Crystal City and Anthony, Texas, to large urban districts such as San Antonio and Fort Worth, Texas, and Little Rock, Arkansas. In addition, educational programs were undertaken for clients other than schools including the City of Dallas, Texas; the Oklahoma City and San Antonio zoos; the Arkansas Arts Council, and many museums, including the Smithsonian Institution Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

1966 - 1968. Planner for HemisFair '68, a World's Fair (and Urban Renewal Project) in San Antonio, Texas. Worked with exhibits, buildings, facilities, publications, with special responsibilities for the MAGIC OF A PEOPLE exhibit, PROJECT Y, and the WOMAN'S PAVILION, serving as Executive Director of

the latter.

1955 - 1968. Early work experience included secretarial and clerical work, teaching creative development programs for children and adults in schools, museums, theaters, and institutional facilities, and free-lance writing for advertising agencies and industrial films.

PUBLICATIONS. LOOK, THINK, DISCOVER, CREATE, a Guide to Teaching Creative Thinking Through Use of Community Resources. Smithsonian Institution, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D. C., 1967.

"Forgiven Sins", short story, A TEXAS CHRISTMAS. A MISCELLANY OF ART, POETRY, AND FICTION. Pressworks, Dallas, Texas, 1986.

I WILL ALWAYS STAY ME. Writings of Migrant Children, co-edited with Robert Coles, published by Texas Monthly Press, Austin, Texas, 1983

CREATING YOUR CITY'S IMAGE. National League of Cities, Washington, D. C., 1962.

I NEED A FRIEND, a juvenile, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York,

BIG ENOUGH, a juvenile, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1970

"The Man Who Loved God", one-act play, BEST SHOFT PLAYS OF 1968, Chilton Publishing Co., New York, 1969

HANNAH JACKSON, a novel, William Morrow Co., New York, 1966.

Magazine articles in TEXAS MONTHLY; URBAN DESIGN, ARTS AND ANTIQUES; METIS: WOMEN AND THEIR WORK; CHALLENGE; VISIONS; URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN.

Appendix B: Interviewees

Center for the Arts Staff

Jerry Allen, Executive Director
Rob Baker, Director of Communications
Stephen Balog, Business Manager/Comptroller
Cecilia Cruz, Operations Assistant
David Dial, Director of Operations
Karen Fischer, Director of Development
Judie Hughes, Administrative Assistant
Jennifer Kim, Research Associate
Leslie Miko, Director of Administration
Althea Parker, Executive Assistant

Center for the Arts Board of Directors

Michaela Cassidy, Board Co-Treasurer
Helene Freed
Amalia Mesa-Bains

Community Members

Marie Acosta-Colon, Mexican Museum
Len Alexander, Management Consultants for the Arts
Bob Allen, City Celebration
Dean Beck-Stewart, Theater Artaud
Fe Bongalan, California Arts Council Expansion Arts Program
Robert Cole, CalPerformances
William Cook, The Wexner Center
Margo Cowan, War Memorial Center for the Performing Arts/Herbst Theatre
Jennifer Dowley, Headlands Center for the Arts
Phil Esparza, El Teatro Campesino
Ruth Felt, San Francisco Performances
Christine Fiedler, Mark Taper Forum
Anne Focke, Arts Consultant
Sonia Grey, Neighborhood Arts Program/San Francisco Arts Commission
Robin Kirck, Paul Dresher Ensemble
John Kreidler, San Francisco Foundation
Joe Lambert, Life on the Water
Larry Larson, Arts Consultant
Devorah Major, Consultant, San Francisco Arts Commission
Bob Martin, Cowell Theatre
Kevin O'Brien, Palace of Fine Arts
Maria Pineda, Galeria de la Raza
Kary Schulman, Grants for the Arts
Susan Silk, Columbia Foundation
Joann Chow Winship, San Francisco Arts Commission

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Sonia Bolanos, Commissioner

Helen Sause, Project Director, Yerba Buena Gardens

Appendix D: Comparison of Center for the Arts with Other Arts Facilities

FACILITY	PHYSICAL PLANT	ANNUAL EXPENSES	% EARNED	% CONTRIBUTED	% GOVT.FUNDS
Alaska Ctr for P.A. Anchorage, AK	2,100 seat theatre	\$2,861,185	44%	10%	46%
	722 seat theatre				
	377 seat theatre				
Calgary Ctr for P.A. Calgary, Canada	2,000 seat theatre	\$5,667,000	58%	0%	42%
	750 seat theatre				
	450 seat theatre				
	225 seat theatre				
Center for the Arts San Francisco, CA	750 seat theatre	\$6,259,000 (per FY94 budget)	23%	36%	41%
	3 galleries				
	Bookstore, Cafe				
Hult Ctr for P.A. Eugene, OR	2,500 seat theatre	\$4,494,338	82%	0%	18%
	500 seat theatre				
	Gallery				
Kentucky Ctr for the Arts Louisville, KY	2,500 seat theatre	\$4,692,558	75%	6%	19%
	625 seat theatre				
	135 seat black box				
	Gift shop, Restaurant				
Playhouse Square, Cleveland, OH	3,000 seat theatre	\$6,749,000	84%	16%	0%
	2,700 seat theatre				
	1,000 seat theatre				
Portland Ctr for P.A. Portland, OR	3,000 seat theatre	\$3,469,982	69%	0%	31%
	2,700 seat theatre				
	900 seat theatre				
	340 seat theatre				
	Restaurant				
Tenn. Perf. Arts Center Nashville, TN	2,442 seat theatre	\$5,268,942	93%	7%	0%
	1,050 seat theatre				
	300 seat black box				

Source: Arts Plan 2000, A Cultural Plan for Portland and the Surrounding Region; by the Wolf Organization, Inc.

Appendix E: Examples of Groups That Have Performed in a 750-800 Seat Theater

The Abbey: The National Theatre of Ireland

Batsheva Dance Company

Black Light Theatre of Prague

Eiko and Koma

Kodo

Lady Gourd Sangoma

LHamo Folk Opera of Tibet

Lola Montes

Missouri Repertory Theatre - Woody Guthrie's American Song

Mixed Blood Theatre Company - Dr. King's Dream

Moscow Studio Theatre

National Theatre of Great Britain

San Francisco Mime Troupe

El Teatro de la Esperanza - Real Women Have Curves

Tekezin Chamber Music Foundation

Theatre Works U.S.A. - Plays to Win: The Story of Jackie Robinson

Urban Bush Women

The Vusisizwe Players and the Market Theatre Company of Johannesburg-
You Strike the Woman, You Strike the Rock

Yukio Sekiya - Hajimari-no-Hajimari

Appendix F: Possible Contacts for Booking Opportunities

Bronx Museum of the Arts: They have produced exceptional shows of Latin artists.

Tel: (212) 681-6000

Caribbean Cultural Center: The Center's director, Marta Vega, has started a for-profit booking agency which specializes in groups from the Caribbean and Africa, cutting edge to folkloric.

Tel: (212) 307-7420

Mexic-Arte Museum: Located in Austin, Texas, this museum is another source of ideas and shows.

Tel: (512) 480-9373

The Mexican Government has a menu of touring visual and performing artists, including such giants as writer Octavio Paz. Call the cultural attache at the consulate for information.

Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, MA: Director Hollister Sturgiss is very knowledgeable about the visual arts in Puerto Rico. He curated the show "New Art from Puerto Rico" which was shown on the East Coast.

Nueva Vision: Millie Melendez, head of this agency, "curates" concerts, and has been working closely with Lincoln Center's recently created jazz department.

Tel: (212) 681-1084

Polarities, Inc.: Produces Latin American art shows. One of their latest shows, "The Nearest Edge of the World: Art in Cuba Now", was very well received.

Tel: (617) 734-0268

Ralph Mercado Management: The agent for all the salsa and merengue artists from Tito Puente to Celia Cruz, Eddie Palmieri to Cheo Feliciano.

Tel: (212) 925-2828

The Woodson Foundation: Books African-American artists, from well-known stars like Carmen McRae to Sweet Honey in the Rock to puppet shows and storytellers for children.

Tel: (800) 832-5556

Appendix G: Sample Revenue Model for Visual Arts Galleries

FY94	
#Weeks Available	39
#Days Available	273
Avg. % Use	75%
#Weeks Use	29
#Days Use	205
Avg. Attendance/Week	300
Income	
Avg. Attendance/Week	300
Avg. ticket price	\$5
TOTAL GALLERY INCOME	\$43,875

Appendix G: Sample Revenue Model for Theater

FY94				
#Weeks Available	39			
#Days Available	273			
Avg. % Use	65%			
#Days Use	177			
% Prest./% Rental		60% / 40%	50% / 50%	40% / 60%
#Days Presenting		106	89	71
#Days Rental		71	89	106
Discipline	% Avail. Days			
Dance	55%			
#Days (including tech, load time)		59	49	39
#Performances		39	33	26
Avg. Ticket Price		\$18	\$18	\$18
Avg. Capacity		40%	40%	40%
Music	30%			
#Days (including tech, load time)		32	27	21
#Performances		26	21	17
Avg. Ticket Price		\$18	\$18	\$18
Avg. Capacity		50%	50%	50%
Theatre	15%			
#Days (including tech, load time)		16	13	11
#Performances		11	9	7
Avg. Ticket Price		\$22	\$22	\$22
Avg. Capacity		60%	60%	60%
Presenting Income (750 seats)				
Dance		\$210,811	\$175,675	\$140,540
Music		\$172,481	\$143,734	\$114,988
Theatre		\$105,405	\$87,838	\$70,270
Total Presenting Income		\$488,697	\$407,248	\$325,798
Rental Income:				
Avg. Rental Fee/Day		\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050
Total Rental Income		\$74,529	\$93,161	\$111,793
TOTAL THEATRE INCOME		\$563,226	\$500,409	\$437,592

Appendix H: History of Growth of Campaign Goals

PURPOSE OF FUNDS	5/31/88	11/6/89	3/1/90	12/1/91
Overrun of construction costs	\$1,900,000*	\$1,900,000		
Furniture/Fixtures		\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
Operating				
Opening activities				\$450,000
Pre-opening operating				\$150,000
First year operating		\$500,000	\$500,000	\$2,000,000
Second year operating				\$2,500,000
Cash Flow Reserve		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Endowment		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
TOTAL GOAL	\$1,900,000	\$6,900,000	\$7,000,000	\$10,600,000
*Operating Board commits to raising this amount to cover construction costs that will be over budget. If they do not, construction of Forum building will be deferred.				

Appendix I: Center for the Arts Budget

	FY 92 BUDGET	FY 92 PROJECTION TO 6/30/92	FY 93 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 94 PROJECTED BUDGET	FY 95 PROJECTED BUDGET
SALARIES & BENEFITS					
<i>Salaries</i>					
EXECUTIVE	113,750	116,250	116,250	116,250	116,250
ADMINISTRATION	135,000	136,283	206,200	206,200	206,200
DEVELOPMENT	122,500	108,893	178,060	186,560	186,560
COMMUNICATIONS	72,500	61,333	144,000	186,000	186,000
PROGRAMS	111,000	72,000	228,000	238,000	238,000
OPERATIONS	68,667	68,833	134,000	189,500	189,500
FRONT OF HOUSE			49,833	277,958	298,750
TECHNICIANS			70,500	498,334	513,000
<i>Merit Increases for Projected Continuing Staff</i>	15,000	2,240	38,528	115,562	154,208
SUB-TOTAL:	638,417	585,832	1,163,371	2,014,364	2,086,468
Mandated & Optional Benefits @ 23%	146,836	130,141	267,575	463,299	479,888
SUB-TOTAL:	785,253	695,973	1,430,946	2,477,663	2,566,355
Administrative Temporary Help	7,500	7,500	10,000	10,000	13,500
Event Related Temporary Help				90,000	100,000
Opening Events Labor				20,000	
Overtime	4,500	4,500	7,200	7,600	7,600
Mandated Benefits @ 9%		1,080	1,548	11,482	10,899
SUBTOTAL - SALARIES & BENEFITS	797,253	709,053	1,449,694	2,616,745	2,698,354
CONTRACTED PERSONNEL					
Security			12,000	275,000	287,500
Maintenance			12,000	275,000	287,500
SUBTOTAL - CONTRACTED PERSONNEL			24,000	550,000	575,000
CONTRACT SERVICES					
Management Consultants	10,000	45,000	12,000	15,000	10,000
Fund Raising Counsel Fees & Expenses	51,000	78,650	90,000	80,000	60,000
Legal Services	25,000	20,000	30,500	20,000	22,500
Accounting Services/Audit	9,000	6,800	7,500	10,000	15,000
Interior Maintenance	6,000	6,000	6,600		
Computer Training	5,000	5,000	6,000	6,000	8,500
Management Audit	6,000		6,000	7,000	7,500
Ground Breaking Events Coordinator	15,000	13,100			
Graphic Design Fees & Expenses	10,000	10,000			
Printing Services				55,000	55,000
Office Renovation	2,500	6,500			
SUBTOTAL - CONTRACT SERVICES	139,500	191,050	158,600	193,000	176,500

	FY 92 BUDGET	FY 92 PROJECTION TO 6/30/92	FY 93 PROJECTED BUDGET	FY 94 PROJECTED BUDGET	FY 95 PROJECTED BUDGET
UTILITIES					
Telephone - 211 Brannen Street	12,000	12,000	15,000		
Telephone - Offsite (includes installation)	2,000	2,000	3,000		
Telephone - Center for the Arts			6,000	36,000	37,800
Electricity & Gas - 211 Brannen Street	7,200	7,200	9,000		
Electricity & Gas - Offsite (includes hookup)	1,500	1,500	2,000		
Electricity & Gas - Center for the Arts			13,500	120,000	126,000
Water & Sewer - Center for the Arts			2,500	12,000	12,500
SUBTOTAL - UTILITIES	22,700	22,700	51,000	168,000	176,300
INSURANCE AND BONDS					
Workers Compensation	7,500	7,500	9,000	12,000	12,300
Commercial General Liability	2,500	2,500	10,000	30,000	31,325
Automobile Liability	1,600	1,600	5,000	5,000	5,200
Builders' Risk			2,000	2,500	2,500
Special Form			6,600	7,000	8,000
Machinery & Equipment				10,000	10,200
Directors and Officers	4,500	4,500	5,000	6,000	6,300
Professional Liability				5,725	6,875
Crime Insurance	800	800	900	1,000	1,050
Fidelity Bond	500	500	500	725	750
SUBTOTAL - INSURANCE AND BONDS	17,400	17,400	39,000	79,950	84,500
MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES					
Memberships	5,000	5,000	6,250	7,000	7,600
Subscriptions	4,000	4,000	5,250	6,000	6,500
Program Planning Supplement	4,000	4,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Travel	20,000	20,000	20,000	22,500	25,000
Relocation Expenses	10,000	10,000			
Entertainment	12,000	12,000	13,000	17,000	18,000
Classified Ads	24,300	24,300	12,500	7,500	10,000
Local Transportation/Parking	5,000	5,000	7,000	8,000	10,000
Postage	6,000	6,000	7,500	10,000	15,000
Courier Service (includes freight charges)	6,000	6,000	7,000	7,500	10,000
Equipment Service /K	7,500	7,500	8,700	14,400	25,000
Miscellaneous Project Expense - Operations	4,000	4,000	3,000		
Maintenance Supplies	2,000	2,000			
Bank Charges	500	500	1,000	2,000	2,000
SUBTOTAL - MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES	110,300	110,300	97,200	107,900	135,100
LINE ITEM BUDGET	1,520,453	1,509,003	2,277,894	6,018,270	6,240,654
CONTINGENCY @ 4%	60,818	60,818	91,106	240,730	249,826
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,581,271	1,569,821	2,369,000	6,259,000	6,490,280
RESERVES					
Interior Capital Improvement (5%)	79,064	79,064	118,450	312,950	324,514
Cash Flow Reserve Fund (4%)	63,251	63,251	94,760	250,361	259,611
TOTAL EXPENSES & TRANSFERS TO RESERVES	1,723,585	1,712,136	2,582,210	6,822,310	7,074,405

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C101693506